FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-218
Friday
9 November 1990

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-218 CONTENTS *9 November 1990*

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Academic Suggests UN 'Nuclear Police Force' *[IZVESTIYA 9 Nov]* 1

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Baker Arrives in Moscow To Discuss Gulf Crisis 3
  Meets With Shevardnadze *[TASS]* 3
  Holds Joint News Conference *[TASS]* 3
  Speaks With Gorbachev *[TASS]* 4
Quayle's Cold War Victory Remarks Criticized *[PRAVDA 3 Nov]* 4
Political Context of U.S. Elections Viewed *[PRAVDA 8 Nov]* 5

China

Commentary Notes PRC Ties, Similar Gulf Stands *[Moscow International]* 7

Northeast Asia

Easing Tensions in Asia-Pacific Area Examined *[Titarenko on Moscow International]* 8
Trade Agreement With North Korea Signed *[IZVESTIYA 4 Nov]* 8
Commentary Views Proposal for Japan-DPRK Ties *[Moscow International]* 8

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Quest for Improved U.S.-SRV Ties Discussed *[PRAVDA 4 Nov]* 9
Manila Criticizes Japan's Gulf Forces Plan *[Moscow International]* 9

Near East & South Asia

Primakov Assesses Arab Role in Gulf Solution *[London AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT 7 Nov]* 10
TASS Cites Kuwaiti Defense Minister on Forces 13
'Islamic Factor' in Policy on Iraq Noted *[Moscow International]* 13
Afghan Islamic Leader Views Soviet POWs *[IZVESTIYA 3 Nov]* 14
Future of Post-'Awn Lebanon Examined *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 1 Nov]* 15
U.S. Embassy's 1979 Takeover in Iran Recalled *[Radio Peace and Progress]* 17

West Europe

FRG's Genscher Greets Gorbachev, Shevardnadze *[TASS]* 18
Commentaries Preview Gorbachev's FRG Visit 18
  Success of Reforms Desired *[IZVESTIYA 9 Nov]* 18
  Planned Treaty Highlighted *[PRAVDA 9 Nov]* 19
Finns Halt Payments, Cite Ruble Confusion *[IZVESTIYA 9 Nov]* 20
Extradition Treaty With Finland Signed *[TASS]* 21
Finnish Commander Questioned on Ties, Draft *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 7 Nov]* 21
NATO Commanders To Visit 'Mid-November' *[TASS]* 22

Supreme Allied Commander Interviewed Before Visit *[TASS]* 22
Archangel Mayor Attends Nuclear-Free Zone Talks *[London PRESS ASSOCIATION 8 Nov]* 22
Italian Party Paper, PRAVDA Group Meet *[PRAVDA 30 Oct]* 23
Statement Issued on Antall's Return to Work *[Budapest MTI]* 23

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet

Supreme Soviet Encounters Inertia, Old Approaches *[IZVESTIYA 3 Nov]* 24

Political & Social

Monarchists Hold Unlawful Moscow Demonstration *[TASS]* 24
KYODO Claims Soviet Union To Change Name 25
Man Who Fired Red Square Shots Arrested *[Moscow TV]* 25
PRAVDA Summarizes Nation-Wide 7 Nov Events *[8 Nov]* 26
    Gorbachev Receives Telegrams *[Moscow Radio]* 29
Security Foundation Protests on TV News *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 6 Nov]* 29
'Interdvizheniye' Groups Set Up Central Council *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 6 Nov]* 29
Call for Interethnic Restructuring Issued *[PRAVITELSTVENNYY VESTNIK No 42]* 30
Lukyanov Outlines Need for 'Civil Consensus' *[IZVESTIYA 3 Nov]* 33
Failure to Provide for Refugees Deplored *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 8 Nov]* 34
New Legal Journal To Appear in 1991 *[IZVESTIYA 8 Nov]* 35
Trade Weekly Aimed at 'More Exacting Tastes' *[IZVESTIYA 8 Nov]* 35
Leaders Sign Zhigalin's Obituary *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 8 Nov]* 36

Economic

Growing Economic Separatism Seen as Threat *[Berlin ADN]* 36
New Foreign Exchange Practices Explained *[IZVESTIYA 7 NOV]* 36
France's Stoleru Views Move to Market Economy *[IZVESTIYA 8 Nov]* 37
*Kolkhoz Market Fresh Food Price Data *[IZVESTIYA 1 Nov]* 39

Agriculture

Agricultural Developments Reported for 4-8 Nov *[Moscow Radio]* 40

Scientific

Chernobyl Station Safety Precautions Examined *[Moscow TV]* 40
USSR Seeks Mexican Satellite Contract *[IZVESTIYA 7 Nov]* 41

Military

Defense Personnel Attend Ceremonial Meeting *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 6 Nov]* 42
Test Pilot G. F. Butenko Dies Suddenly *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 6 Nov]* 42

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Lithuania Protests 7 November Military Parade *[Vilnius Radio]* 43
    Burokevicius Discusses Parade *[Moscow International]* 43
Landsbergis Appeals for CSCE Membership *[Vilnius Radio]* 43
Lithuania Supreme Council Adopts Resolutions 44
    On Military Service *[Vilnius Radio]* 44
    On Border Service *[Vilnius International]* 44
Lithuanian Plan for Separate Budget 'Serious' *[PRAVDA 9 Nov]* 44
Lithuanians Told They Need Not Answer Draft *[IZVESTIYA 7 Nov]* 44

Lithuania Aide Views Economic Ties With USSR
[Copenhagen BERLINGSKE TIDENDE 5 Nov] 45
Estonia Forms Goods Export Quotas for Citizens *[TASS]* 45
Estonian Front Supports 'Centrist Policy' *[Tallinn Radio]* 45
Riga Water Supply 'Poisoned', Pressure Drops *[Riga Radio]* 45

RSFSR

Silayev Says Russia To Strengthen Sovereignty *[Moscow International]* 46
Kozyrev Discusses Foreign Policy Objectives 46
    Move to 'Democratisation' Seen *[TASS]* 46
    On Participation in CSCE *[TASS]* 46
    On RSFSR Security *[NEW TIMES No 43]* 46
Possible Candidate for Defense Minister Named *[MOSCOW NEWS No 37]* 49
Journalist Laments Ministers' Absences Abroad *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 7 Nov]* 49
KGB Investigating Bomb Explosions in Krasnoyarsk *[Moscow TV]* 49
RSFSR-Hyundai Agreement Not 'Trade Contract' *[PRAVDA 7 Nov]* 50

Western Republics

Dubossary Official Cited on Moldovan Situation *[TASS]* 50
Mass Demonstration Held in Lugansk 7 Nov *[Kiev Radio]* 51
Reports Examine All-Ukraine 'Rukh' Assembly 51
    Chairman Interviewed *[Budapest MAYGAR HIRLAP 3 Nov]* 51
    Future Prospects Viewed *[Kiev International]* 52
Lvov Printers Halt Publication of Newspapers *[IZVESTIYA 7 Nov]* 53
Belorussian Cities Hold 7 November Celebrations *[Minsk Radio]* 54
Belorussian Deputies View Contacts With Cuba *[Havana TV]* 54
Abridged Belorussian Market Program Issued *[SELSKAYA GAZETA 25 Oct]* 55

Caucasus

Armenian Resolution Called Unconstitutional *[Moscow Radio]* 57
Trade Unions Claim Tourist Facilities' Ownership *[TASS]* 57

Central Asia

Uzbek Party To Seek Autonomy Within CPSU *[IZVESTIYA 7 Nov]* 57
Uzbek Supreme Soviet Reviews Refugees, Economy *[IZVESTIYA 3 Nov]* 58
Soldier's 'Mothers of Kazakhstan' Congress Meets
[KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA 31 Oct] 58

Academic Suggests UN 'Nuclear Police Force'

PM0811210590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
9 Nov 90 Union Edition p 3

[Article by Academician V. Goldanskiy: "UN Nuclear Force? A Soviet Scientist's Proposals"]

[Text] Today I no longer believe in the feasibility of transition to a nuclear-free world during the remaining 10 years of the 20th century. Whether we like it or not, we will evidently be obliged to reconcile ourselves to the existence of nuclear weapons in the immediate future. But in what form and in what numbers? Does this mean that nuclear tests will also continue, to the detriment of the atmosphere—above all, the public and political atmosphere?

In the quest for an answer to these questions, today I wish to advance some new proposals whose implementation could, in my view, make the world safer and bring the nuclear-free era closer. But first a few words about facts that are of concern to everyone—above all, the recent underground nuclear explosion carried out on Novaya Zemlya by the Soviet Union.

In my view, it rightly elicited a sharply adverse response from public opinion both in our country and abroad. True, mention must be made of our 19-month unilateral moratorium during 1985-1987 and the more than one-year silence at Soviet nuclear test sites from October 1989 through October 1990. Yet during the same time seven explosions have been carried out on the U.S. test site in Nevada (during 1987-1989, according to data cited in IZVESTIYA No 274, there were 39 explosions in the United States and 47 in our country). Three other nuclear countries—Britain, France, and China—also have "a finger in the pie," as the saying goes.

Yet, in connection with the 24 October test on Novaya Zemlya, I recall the words which Joseph Fouche spoke after Napoleon ordered that the Duke d'Enghien be captured outside France and shot: "It was worse than a crime—it was a blunder." It is hard to describe as anything else an action which further exacerbates relations between the leadership of the USSR and the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] and creates a factor of inimicability toward M.S. Gorbachev in Scandinavian countries on the eve of his triumphal Nobel visit to Oslo and Stockholm.

However, I would like to look not to the past but to the future. I will try briefly to describe the state of affairs with regard to nuclear weapons, as I see it in the light of the present-day picture of the world.

I am sure that no real danger now exists of a "hot war" between one or another (or several) of the five current nuclear powers—in any combination.

I am also convinced that not one of these five powers, which have seen for themselves the awful destructiveness of nuclear explosions, will be the first to use nuclear weapons either against each other or against any third country, regardless of whether or not a given nuclear country has proclaimed corresponding declarations (although, of course, such declarations are highly desirable!). But under such conditions, from my viewpoint, there is no point in nuclear powers' having in their arsenals multiple-charge systems for the delivery of nuclear warheads (so-called MIRV's), nuclear charges with a megaton yield, or any tactical nuclear weapons at all—the majority of types of first- and second-generation nuclear weapons currently in the arsenal. Work on creating third-generation nuclear weapons is all the more pointless.

At the same time it has to be acknowledged that some other countries in the world already are—or could become in the very near future—"underground" possessors of nuclear weapons, for example India, Israel, the Republic of South Africa, Pakistan, Iraq, the DPRK, Argentina, Brazil, and others—and they will not need any preliminary tests to be fully sure of the effectiveness of such weapons. Nor do I rule out the possibility of nuclear weapons falling into the hands of organized criminal groups—let me remind you in this context that the smallest models of modern nuclear weapons weigh only approximately 50 kg, have a diameter of less than 20 cm, and explode with a yield equivalent to approximately 1,000 tonnes of TNT. What is to be done about these dangers?

Missiles with a very high degree of accuracy and great depth of penetration, not even necessarily carrying nuclear charges (and, if they do, ones of minimal yield), appear the most effective to give a warning or to punish specific architects of aggression in the "nuclear underground."

The U.S. and our own armorers now usually substantiate the need to continue nuclear tests with reference to the need to enhance the reliability and safety of nuclear weapons. What they understand here by reliability is the condition that the weapon should operate efficiently whenever necessary, and what they mean by safety is that it should not operate without the involvement of people initiated into the secrets of safety and code systems, "by itself," or in criminal hands, even under any extraordinary conditions.

Thus, it is a question of seeking an absolutely reliable guarantee against any unpremeditated, chance catastrophic events. It can be considered that in all models of existing nuclear weapons both in the United States and in the USSR the possibility of an unpremeditated nuclear explosion is virtually ruled out—even if the chemical explosive surrounding the nuclear core were to explode. However, another danger exists—that such an explosion would result in the discharge of very tiny particles of highly toxic, radioactive plutonium into the atmosphere. And the quantity of plutonium in an ordinary nuclear charge is just three or four times less than the total quantity of this substance ejected during the Chernobyl disaster (approximately 20 kg).

I will repeat here what I wrote repeatedly during our 1985-1987 moratorium in opposing the U.S. nuclear tests (see, for example, IZVESTIYA No 335 for 30 November 1986): Full-scale tests involving nuclear explosions are certainly not essential to check the reliability and safety of nuclear weapons, for it is possible to manage with a sum total of checks of individual components, as well as "mathematical experiments" on computers and so on, but without exploding a nuclear charge.

So, a nuclear-free world remains a goal for the future. For the time being I see the creation of an international nuclear police force under UN auspices as an extremely necessary and inevitable stage on the way to it, when the Security Council and its Military Staff Committee must collectively have at their disposal not only "paper" but also real "buttons" for the immediate and effective use of this force against any nuclear aggressor. Such a UN nuclear force must be created against the background of a simultaneous and very strong reduction in the nuclear arms of the United States and the USSR (to approximately 1,000-2,000 charges), the guaranteed and controlled full destruction of chemical and biological weapons, a sharp reduction in conventional arms, progress on the way to creating an all-European and an Asia-and-Pacific security system, political and economic cooperation, the elimination of existing interregional conflicts, and the prevention of new ones.

The UN nuclear force would have to be preserved for a while even after the total elimination of all national nuclear arms, and only then be eliminated under strict international control.

As for underground nuclear tests, if there is no way the United States can renounce them, let us reach agreement on conducting all such tests jointly, gradually reducing their frequency and the upper limit for the permitted yield of an explosion. Where? In Nevada, for example, since the authorities in that state gave their consent to the functioning of a nuclear test site there. I believe that in this way we could really help to strengthen mutual trust, bring substantially nearer the complete cessation of nuclear tests, strengthen the Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons, and make potential nuclear aggressors listen to reason, in other words create the necessary preconditions for transition to a nuclear-free world.

United States & Canada

Baker Arrives in Moscow To Discuss Gulf Crisis

Meets With Shevardnadze

LD0811211990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2015 GMT 8 Oct 90

[Text] Moscow, 8 Nov. (TASS)—Talks began early this morning between Eduard Shevardnadze, USSR minister of foreign affairs, and James Baker, U.S. secretary of state, who is in the USSR on a working visit and continued until late at night. A broad range of international problems was covered.

Experts were involved in a detailed discussion of issues concerning disarmament, in particular the reduction of conventional weapons in Europe, and the strategic offensive weapons of the USSR and the United States.

A great deal of time was devoted to comprehensively considering Persian Gulf situation and searching for ways to overcome the crisis. Preference was given to peaceful solutions. The need was stressed to implement the resolution of the UN Security Council. Satisfaction was expressed at the level of Soviet-U.S. interaction in this complex and explosive situation. Attention was paid to the desire to preserve interaction in the future too.

The discussion of regional problems—Afghanistan, the situation in southern Africa, and in the Horn of Africa area—was imbued with a joint striving to facilitate the removal of chronic sore conflicts. The constructive character of the Soviet-U.S. dialogue provides grounds for counting on real results possibly being acheived in these areas in the very near future.

A specific study of a number of specific aspects relating to the reduction of conventional armaments in Europe was aimed at ensuring the timely preparation of a treaty which is due to be signed at the Paris summit meeting on 19 November this year. Progress was achieved on key issues. This treaty, as well as other documents which will be adopted at the Paris meeting, will make it a major event in European and world politics.

The ministers confirmed with satisfaction the existence of progress at the Geneva talks on reducing strategic offensive armaments, although a number of complex military-technical matters have to be resolved, with regard to the elaboration of a treaty on strategic offensive armaments that is attainable by the end of the present year. In Moscow the ministers recorded an accord on such a complex and long-discussed subject as the noncircumvention of a future treaty on strategic offensive armaments, and some movement was discernible in some other areas too.

Overall, the talks between the ministers took place in a businesslike and committed atmosphere, and they were marked by the desire of the two sides to make maximum use of the positive potential of Soviet-U.S. relations.

Holds Joint News Conference

LD0811175490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1704 GMT 8 Nov 90

[Report by TASS diplomatic correspondents Konstantin Voytsekhovich and Georgiy Shmelev]

[Text] Moscow, 8 Nov (TASS)—The central place in the talks with U.S. Secretary of State James Baker was occupied by a discussion of the situation in the Persian Gulf. This was stated today by USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze at the joint news conference with James Baker.

This same question was examined thoroughly during the conversation which just ended between USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev and the U.S. Secretary of state, he added.

During the discussion, the minister reported, the sides noted the high level of cooperation in seeking a settlement of the crisis, and confirmed their readiness to continue to act jointly with the aim of fulfilling the well-known resolutions of the UN Security Council. Eduard Shevardnadze pointed out that the USSR and the United States give priority to peaceful, political methods of resolving the conflict and "there are no differences in the sides' positions here." He added that conversation on this theme will be continued late this evening.

Replying to questions from journalists, the USSR foreign minister noted at the same time that, while giving preference to political methods, "one probably cannot totally exclude" the possibility of using force. "A situation might arise," he continued, "which really requires such a decision." At the same time, Eduard Shevardnadze stated that such decisions should be taken within the framework of the UN Security Council, the UN Organization, and the whole world community.

U.S. Secretary of State James Baker spoke of the necessity for Iraq to fulfil the appropriate UN Security Council resolutions and rejected the possibility of "partial solutions." He highly assessed Soviet-U.S. cooperation in settling the crisis from its very start, and stressed Washington's readiness to continue such cooperation. The head of the U.S. foreign policy department also came out in favor of a political settlement of the conflict, while not excluding the possibility of the use of force.

Eduard Shevardnadze also reported that within the framework of the present Soviet-U.S. negotiations, working groups in various areas are operating. He noted that the experts have reached "encouraging" results during the examination of remaining unresolved problems connected with preparations for an agreement on reducing conventional Armed Forces in Europe. "Progress has also been achieved" in the working group which is examining prepartions for a Soviet-U.S. treaty on reducing strategic offensive armaments, the Soviet minister said.

During the meeting, questions were discussed connected with a settlement in Afghanistan, where the sides' positions, according to Eduard Shevardnadze, "slowly, step by step are getting closer," the situation in the south of Africa, the African Horn, and a few other regions.

The head of the Soviet foreign policy department informed journalists that during today's meeting between USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev and James Baker "a few issues of bilateral cooperation" were also touched upon.

Speaks With Gorbachev

LD0811191190 TASS International Service in Russian 1816 GMT 8 Nov 90

[Report by television presenters Leonid Elin and Galina Zimenkova; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Elin] As people say, there are no holidays or leave periods in international politics. The proof of this is the current timetable of the USSR president's work.

[Zimenkova] Today Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev received U.S. Secretary of State James Baker. The talks, which lasted about two hours, took place in an atmosphere reflecting the new level of relations between the USSR and the United States, which makes it possible to discuss any question in a confidential and detailed manner. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev told the guest about the particular features of the period which the country is going through, a period which is complex and contradictory, but which also presents great opportunities. During the celebration of the October revolution anniversary, he said, we saw for ourselves that the overwhelming majority of people believe in commonsense and consolidation. This majority made itself felt virtually everywhere and expressed itself powerfully in favor of perestroyka.

Democracy, the USSR president said, does not rule out discipline, order, and stability. Indeed it presupposes them. We shall proceed on this basis as we undertake decisive steps in the next few months toward a market economy and toward a new Union treaty. In so doing we are mindful of our responsibility both to our people and to the whole world, and we believe that everyone should have and interest in the success of our reforms.

Secretary of State Baker underlined this idea. The reforms being carried out in the USSR, Secretary of State Baker said, demand great courage, and we sincerely wish the Soviet leadership success. The two men held detailed talks with regard to the situation developing in the Persian Gulf region. The theme of Soviet-U.S. dialogue has from the very beginning of the crisis been the need for unity among all countries, particularly those which belong to the UN Security Council, a categorical refusal to accept aggression, and the general demand that Iraqi troops unconditionally withdraw from Kuwait. Nobody, the USSR president stressed, should count on cracks appearing in this agreed position. He highly praised the readiness of the U.S. leadership to consult over the situation and its possible development.

On behalf of U.S. President George Bush, James Baker set out a number of ideas which the Soviet side will closely study

Certain other questions of mutual interest were also discussed.

Quayle's Cold War Victory Remarks Criticized

PM0811164390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Nov 90 Second Edition p 4

[Commentary by Anatoliy Karpychev under the rubric: "My Opinion": "Who Won the Cold War?"]

[Text] There are a great many complicated questions in life. It is not always easy to find the answers to them. But in this case wisdom and patience come to the rescue.

That East and West have finally managed to surmount the cold war is undoubtedly a fact of historic significance. There can be no two opinions on the matter. But is there any point in looking for victors and vanquished?

The question has been raised before, and I thought the answer had been given: There can be no victors in the cold war. What individual victors could there possibly be when the world was on the brink of nuclear catastrophe, when fear had taken root in people's hearts, and the "enemy image" overshadowed all reason and humanity?... Now, when we want to shake off this nightmare as quickly as possible and when the very idea of laurels of victory sounds blasphemous, we again hear the words:

"We won the cold war, and many historians in the future will write about why we won."

We could not believe our ears. However.... Speaking in Washington, U.S. Vice President Dan Quayle uttered precisely these words: "We won...."

He continued: "One of the reasons why we won is that the Soviet Union realised the United States is prepared to invest in strengthening its national security and implementing the Strategic Defense Initiative. The Russians knew that any attempt to change the correlation of forces would fail."

U.S. politicians from the old administration once said that you cannot dance the tango alone. It takes two to tango. If we are to avoid picking each other up on every word, as we did in the past, and if we do not want to strike a pose or slam the door shut but look at things seriously, then the truth is that East and West came to realize that they could not continue living by the laws of the cold war. It was then that we took steps to meet each other halfway.

This year has been characterized by these steps. It was confirmed in the summer at the NATO Council session in London that the cold war has come to an end. "NATO has lost its opponent," NATO figures say. "We intend to change our military doctrine," Defense Secretary Cheney assured everyone during a visit to Moscow. There are a great many signs of mutual understanding, and we should take pleasure in this, because the world has begun to breathe more easily and excellent prospects are opening up before us.

I am glad, but I cannot stop wondering why the vice president should need to return to the subject of cold war victors. What was the point of him making this statement? Did he wish to remind people of the might of his own country and the West as a whole on the eve of the conference of heads of state and government scheduled for 19-21 November in Paris to discuss the task of building a new Europe? Yes, the Soviet Union will also be taking part in this big meeting, which will evidently also discuss the end of the cold war.... But it will not be there as a country defeated—it will be there as a full participant, if you like, and even as an initiator of change in the world.

Maybe the purpose of the vice president's statement was to exploit the severity of the problems and difficulties in our country and try to use the force of "victor" to bring pressure to bear on the Soviet Union? But I thought the practice and era of trials of strength had receded into the past, so why try to bring them back?

Of course, one can agree with Quayle's next statement, namely, that the crisis situation in the Persian Gulf "serves as a reminder that the struggle for peace is not yet over." Yes, it is indeed a lesson and provides grounds for serious thought. Quayle said that more and more countries are acquiring mass destruction weapons and the means to deliver them. So what conclusion did he draw from this? "We need the Strategic Defense Initiative more than ever before."

Laying claim to victory and defending the concept of the Strategic Defense Initiative are two sides of the same medal. A medal cast in the mold of the past, unfortunately. I, for example, would never want to wear this medal. I would never venture to call myself the winner of the infamous cold war. It will take us a long time to erase the traces that this war has left in the hearts of whole generations. It will take years to shake off the accumulated fear and mistrust.

I also would not venture to call myself victor because not everyone is in agreement with the morality of the assessment. The triumph of good and reason is something to be proud of. But can one really take pride in something that has sown evil?

It is now more important for us all to think about a peaceful future for Europe and the whole world rather than about who won the cold war. I can say with confidence that there will be no vanquished in this future. In my view, this must always be the starting point when deciding the question of the triumph of reason and victors.

Political Context of U.S. Elections Viewed

PM0811171990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Nov 90 Second Edition p 5

[Article by PRAVDA correspondent V. Linnik: "Mutiny on the Republican Ship: United States: 1990 Elections"]

[Text] New York, 7 Nov—In this country, where the voters' lack of confidence in Washington is as deep-rooted as their hatred of taxes, this year has been marked by a striking antipathy toward legislators. So many unflattering epithets and stern messages have been addressed to Congress alone on the eve of the 6 November election! What in particular has happened this time?

The entire House of Representatives and one-third of the Senate were up for reelection on 6 November. In U.S. political life there are some ancient canons. They are: The party which wins the battle for the White House traditionally suffers defeats in the subsequent elections to Congress. Two years ago a Republican was elected President, consequently, on 6 November, like it or not, the Republicans had to sacrifice on the altar of tradition a proportion of their seats in the House and the Senate. So omniscient statistics consider a loss of 10 to 12 House seats and two to four Senate seats "tolerable." The outcome of the contest for the governorships, which is not directly connected with the battles for Washington, is determined more by local specifics.

It would not have mattered had the President's party had a sufficient safety margin in Congress at election time. However, it was all quite the reverse. The Republicans were heavily outnumbered in the Senate and even more so in the House. Therefore, disdaining those election canons, they launched themselves into an all-out election campaign with the intention of making up their earlier deficit and preparing a base for regaining control in both houses by the time of the next presidential election. A couple of months ago it seemed that their enterprise would be rewarded—the President was more popular than ever, riding high on a wave of universal enthusiasm which initially accompanied the sending of U.S. troops to the Persian Gulf. Over 70 percent of Americans thought him a good president at that time. Not taking advantage of that, not trying to turn the Republican President's popularity into victory for Republican Party candidates in the elections would have been tantamount to completely failing to understand U.S. politics. It is no wonder, therefore, that the White House was eager to translate the soldiers' confident stride across the sands of Saudi Arabia into a Republican victory march on polling day.

At first some particularly keen optimists in the Republican Party apparatus even talked about securing a majority in the Senate. When they calmed down a little they set themselves a more modest task: If they could not win a majority, they should at least increase their representation in both houses. The White House directed this strategy with President Bush acting as a player-coach.

The vigor with which he joined in the election race even impressed old hands at this game. Speaking in support of his party's candidates, he covered many thousands of miles traveling the country and visiting dozens of states, some of them several times. What contender for elected office can resist the temptation to turn the entourage and brilliance of presidential power to his own advantage? The President's presence in an electoral district always means the greatest possible publicity and the maximum amount of money flowing into the candidate's coffers. What true Republican will miss a dinner with the President for the candidate's benefit, even if a ticket costs him $250, $500, or $1,000? I hope that the reader will not be surprised by the relationship between big politics in the United States and base metal. Here is an illustration: a newly elected U.S. senator needs to secure $9,000 a week for 6 years to prepare for the costs of his next election campaign. It is not hard to guess what is the main occupation here and what is secondary: writing laws or collecting money.

One way or another, it seemed for several weeks that the Republicans' scenario was to be brilliantly confirmed. However, their pre-election strategy ran into several snags. First, the interminable budget disputes between the White House and Congress and between Republicans and Democrats. President Bush was forced to go back on his magic phraseof "Read my lips—no new taxes" which two years ago earned him so many brownie points in the struggle for the presidency. It is understandable that such apostasy, especially on the eve of the congressional elections, won him no praise among his party colleagues. Every politician in America is terrified of arousing the voters' discontent in election year. It is hard to think of a surer method of arousing such discontent than promising to raise taxes.

But it did not end there. The President categorically refused to raise taxes on profits or to increase income tax on high-earning Americans. This was immediately followed by accusations from the Democrats that the Republicans were protecting the interests of the rich. Undoubtedly that is so, but one point should be clarified here—in this respect the Democrats and their opponents are not far apart. But big politics, as is well known, begins where people learn to hide their intentions. The Republicans in Congress were particularly irate at failing to do that this time.

When the President had to renege on his promises yet again, the Republicans were so infuriated that open mutiny broke out on the party ship. Dozens of legislators voted against their president's proposal. In their electoral districts candidates dissociated themselves from G. Bush, stating to voters that they wanted nothing to do with the reckless attack on taxpayers.

But even these desperate steps only managed to limit the scale of the political damage that the Republicans suffered: It was too late to escape harm completely. Polls on the eve of election day showed that the voters considered the Democrats' approach to taxation fairer than the Republicans' by 44 to 31 percent. Bush's political acrobatics during the skirmishes with the Democrats over the budget immediately affected his popularity. In two months the proportion of Americans approving what he was doing as President fell to its lowest point during his term in the White House (around 48 percent, according to poll figures). The quite recent euphoria gave way to bitter estimates about the scale of the forthcoming defeat. "As I understand it, the situation that the Republicans are now in is close to disastrous," D. Bailey, a Republican Party strategist, noted just before 6 November. "It could get even worse."

On seeing such a dramatic turn of events, the White House attempted on the very eve of the voting to "change gear" and place the conflict in the Persian Gulf at the center of the pre-election dialogue. This is why in late October to early November the U.S. secretary of state and the President were making tough speeches about the fate of the U.S. Embassy in Kuwait, the U.S. hostages, and the Kuwaitis themselves. The U.S. mass media instantly started speaking about the inevitable commencement of combat operations. "Of course, it would be the height of cynicism to assume that the Bush administration would start a war over a dozen seats in Congress," B. Bozell [name as transliterated], a local political expert, commented on this circumstance. But it is hardly cynical to think that the President is doing everything possible to divert attention from the confusion which he and his aides have created in Washington.

The only consolation for the Republicans in this situation is probably the fact that the voters, irritated at the muddle in Washington, directed their anger not only against them. All legislators, regardless of party allegiance, were objects of discontent. The voters rightly reckoned that the powers that be, who are maintained out of their pockets, are failing to cope with the tasks entrusted to them. Either because they cannot or because they do not want to. A wave of sympathy flowed out to outsiders and nonprofessionals, to those unconnected with the established power structure. It was on this wave that amendments to constitutions restricting the holding of elected posts by legislators were adopted in a number of states (California, Oklahoma, Colorado). Twelve years, the voters reasoned, is the maximum time for which the people's elected representatives should be trusted. After this, as many people have seen for themselves, politicians begin to merge with "special interest groups." This, in Aesopian language, is the name for everyone in America, ranging from the General Motors and Boeing corporations to the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. Understandably, the influence of these associations is simply incomparable. But in the local vocabulary compiled specially to befuddle brains it sounds equally sinister—special interest groups!

This year the voter could be as displeased as he liked with Washington politicians. But the U.S. power pyramid lives according to its own laws. In East Europe political parties are growing like mushrooms after rain. But no one here yet has any intention of abolishing the monopoly of the two-party system. Insurmountable and perfectly legal obstacles are placed in the way of other parties. Matters went still further in these elections: Precisely 87 members of Congress for both parties ran for reelection with no rivals whatever. This means that almost one-fifth of the members of the House of Representatives and four of the 34 senators seeking reelection this year were elected on a single-candidate basis, as we are now accustomed to saying. These are the highest indicators of this kind since 1914.

Monopolies have long argued, perfectly reasonably to their own mind, like this: We deal not with the parties but with a specific legislator sitting on a committee of importance to us. Consequently, money will flow to him in an equally generous stream, regardless of his party allegiance. In this situation an outsider cannot fight his way through. "A kind of vicious circle has been created," L. Kunst of the newly created "Coalition Against an Irremovable Congress" said. "An outsider cannot amass money because everyone thinks that he cannot win elections. But he will never be able to win unless he amasses money." The result is that 96 to 98 percent of members of Congress are regularly reelected in every election, regardless of the voters' mood. This year, which is unusual according to all outward signs, has been no exception.

This election campaign was also noteworthy for the scandalous nature of the polemics among the aspirants. Distortion of a rival's service record, provocative television advertisements, epithets which would have been better held back—all this was present in abundance in the pre-election dialogues. However, I will hasten to reassure the concerned reader: In this sphere we still give the much-vaunted transatlantic democracy a clear start. Nevertheless, individual features of the election battles which have ended merit a mention. The "Gopak" [name as transliterated] organization of conservative Republicans (the coincidence in the way the name sounds is quite fortuitous—V.L.) sent the Republican Party's local organizations a glossary of 133 words which, as the accompanying letter reports, should be used for self-eulogy and to humiliate opponents. "Pathetic, incompetent, corruption, bureaucracy, slump, radical, total license"—this set, so the compilers advise, well characterizes the political opponents. Precisely 69 "strong, optimistic and positive" words should be applied to their own party—such as "humane, foresight, confident, open, sincere, courage, principles, challenge, common sense, peace, in the lead."

China

Commentary Notes PRC Ties, Similar Gulf Stands

OW0911021890 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0700 GMT 8 Nov 90

[Commentary by Alekseyev]

[Text] First, I want to point out that strengthening good-neighborly relations and cooperation between the Soviet Union and China has attracted much attention from various countries in the Asian-Pacific. This is why I will comment on views frequently reflected by the media of various countries in the region.

These countries hold that normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations last spring and the rapid development of good-neighborly relations and cooperation between the two countries were the direct outcome of relaxation of international tensions which began at the end of the 1980's. This view was reflected by Bangkok's THAI RAT. I hold that this view is somewhat one-sided. As is known to all, improvement of relations between the two countries began in the early part of the 1980's, and the international situation was rather tense at that time.

Nevertheless, it is wrong to think that the restoration of good-neighborly relations between the Soviet Union and China has nothing to do with changes in the international situation. Everything in this world is related. As pointed out by Gorbachev, Soviet-Chinese relations are an inseparable part of the system of complex international relations. What is very important is that the consolidation of good-neighborly relations and cooperation between the Soviet Union and China has an impact on the international situation, particularly on the Asian-Pacific region.

Take the Cambodian issue as an example. The Soviet Union and China are actively participating in the formulation of a solution to the Cambodian issue. This could not have happened two or three years ago because of long-standing differences in principle on this question between Moscow and Beijing. Cooperation on this issue is now a reality. In mid-September, the Soviet Union, China, and the three other permanent members of the United Nations Security Council formulated and adopted a plan for resolving the Cambodian conflict. This plan is now supported by all factions in Cambodia and by the international community.

Obviously, cooperation between the Soviet Union and China has played an important role in settling the Cambodian conflict, particularly if the close relationship between China and the three Cambodian resistance factions is taken into consideration.

The nearly identical stand adopted by Moscow and Beijing regarding the situation in the Gulf has also attracted wide attention.

Of course, people still remember that not long ago whenever a hot spot emerged on the globe, Moscow and Beijing would certainly undertake a propaganda war and hurl attacks at each other. However, Moscow and Beijing, like allies cherishing the same ideals and following the same path, have adopted a similar stand on the situation in the Gulf. Does this signal the beginning of a new era in the history of international relations? The normalization of relations between the Soviet Union and China has made important contributions to the beginning of this new era.

Northeast Asia

Easing Tensions in Asia-Pacific Area Examined

SK0811003890 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 6 Nov 90

[Speech by Mikhail Titarenko, director of the Far East Institute in Moscow under the USSR Academy of Sciences, from the "Today's World" program under the "Focus on Asia" program—recorded]

[Text] The process of transition from confrontation to dialogue and cooperation in Europe is gaining momentum in Asia as well. This is expressed, above all, by the fact that the years of confrontation between the Soviet Union and the United States are gradually becoming past history. This confrontation involved many countries in the Asian and Pacific region in various ways.

The foreign ministers of the two countries expressed their views in their talks last summer that the Soviet Union and the United States do not regard each other as hostile nations, not only in Europe but in Asia as well. This throws the issues of disarmament, security, and the reduction of forces stationed in the Asian-Pacific region into a new perspective.

We can say that there is an increasing understanding among social and political circles in Asia for utilizing the experience of Helsinki and Europe. I would like to call attention to the fact that there has been positive progress in the dialogue between Pyongyang and Seoul. This is the beginning of North-South exchanges for easing tensions, strengthening mutual stability, and easing rules and regulations imposed on the people.

As is known, the permanent members of the UN Security Council reached a mutual understanding when they defined the methods for solving the Cambodian issue. The process of normalizing relations between China and Vietnam is under way. The contacts between Pyongyang and Washington are realized. I think that this, in time, could lead to a change in the U.S. position on the issue of the U.S. troops on the Korean peninsula. The Soviet Union has established diplomatic relations with the ROK. This will never cause damage to the security of the DPRK, an old friend of ours.

I should like to note, in particular, the Soviet-China talks for the reduction of troops stationed along the border between the two countries. This is real progress, made for the specific process of disarmament in Asia. This can be a good example for other countries in the region. I believe that the forthcoming visit to Japan by Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev will contribute to mutual understanding in USSR-Japan relations.

Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze, in a meeting in Vladivostok this year, noted the possibility of forming a means for cooperation and security between Asia and Europe. This refers to the relations of new civilization between the two great continents, the centers of the world's civilization.

Trade Agreement With North Korea Signed

PM0711112990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Nov 90 Union Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Agreement Signed"]

[Text] Talks were held in Moscow 2 November between USSR and DPRK trade delegations, as a result of which an intergovernmental agreement was signed on the transition to a new mechanism of economic ties between the two countries, providing for the switch as of 1991 to transactions and payments in freely convertible currency and to current world prices. The agreement was signed on the Soviet side by K.F. Katushev, USSR minister of foreign economic relations, and on the Korean side by Kim Tal-hyon, vice premier of the DPRK Administration Council, chairman of the Foreign Economic Committee, and DPRK minister of foreign trade.

Son Song-pil, DPRK ambassador to the USSR, was present at the signing.

Commentary Views Proposal for Japan-DPRK Ties

SK0811112690 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 7 Nov 90

[Report by station commentator Igor Lebedev from the "Focus on Asia" program]

[Text] An intergovernmental meeting between Japan and the DPRK to negotiate the establishment of diplomatic relations has come to a close. In connection with this, our station commentator Igor Lebedev writes:

I recall the fact that Tokyo proposed that talks on establishing diplomatic relations begin without preconditions, and that is what the DPRK leadership said when a delegation of Japan's ruling Liberal Democratic Party led by Shin Kanemaru, a renowned political activist, visited Pyongyang in late September. Pyongyang proposed that such relations be established as early as December. Some people in Tokyo have positively assessed the DPRK's proposal, even though they have pointed out that it would take much time to establish such relations. (?They said that) this is because it is necessary to carefully prepare for the talks to discuss this important issue and because [words indistinct]. For example, in November, the Japanese emperor's coronation ceremony will be held; Japanese Foreign Minister Taro Nakayama will visit the Soviet Union; and Japan will write a budget for the next fiscal year. Therefore, there are many things to do. As a result, Tokyo proposed that talks on normalizing relations between Tokyo and Pyongyang be postponed until late January. As KYODO has pointed out, at the Beijing meeting, the two sides failed to agree on the exact dates, venue, and agenda of the talks. No mutual agreement was reached on Japan's compensation to the DPRK for the era of Japanese colonial rule. However, no doubt, the establishment of diplomatic relations between the two countries will contribute to the interests of the two countries and the overall process of stepping up security in Asia and the Far East.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Quest for Improved U.S.-SRV Ties Discussed

PM0711115390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Nov 90 Second Edition p 7

[Article by PRAVDA correspondent M. Domogatskikh: "Time To Call Off the Dogs. Vietnamese-U.S. Relations"]

[Text] Hanoi—"The time has come for the normalization of Vietnamese-U.S. relations, for the U.S. abandonment of the policy of hostility toward Vietnam. There is no longer any moral or legal right to continue the embargo policy, which does nothing but harm to relations of cooperation between the two countries"—these words, uttered by SRV Deputy Foreign Minister Le Mai at the World Affairs Council, a U.S. nongovernmental organization to which university professors, research center academics, and businessmen belong, were deeply appreciated in the United States.

Perhaps it was the awareness of this fact that made the U.S. Administration eat its words and invite—for the first time in the 45-year existence of independent Vietnam—such a senior Vietnamese figure as Nguyen Co Thach, SRV deputy prime minister and foreign minister, to Washington. For the first time in decades the leaders of the foreign policy departments have held talks on a very specific topic: What needs to be done in order to normalize relations between the two countries and remove the accretions that have built up over the years and are preventing the establishment of ties that meet the demands of the present-day international situation.

In the course of the normalization of Vietnamese-U.S. relations, the Vietnamese foreign minister said, following repeated meetings between the two countries' official representatives and, in particular, following the talks with U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker, the sides have arrived at a better understanding of one another's positions and have expressed a wish to normalize their foreign policy links as quickly as possible in the common interest. Although this will be a difficult and lengthy process, it has to be completed successfully. This is the demand of the peoples of Vietnam and America.

During the visit Nguyen Co Thach had meetings with General John Vessey, former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and now the U.S. President's special envoy to the organization engaged in searching for the remains of U.S. servicemen missing in action during the war in Vietnam.

It should be said that the MIA problem has always been a raw nerve in relations between the two countries. Refuting the unpleasant rumors that there are prisoners of war who are still alive and are being kept in secret, Vietnam has clearly and earnestly stated that there is not a single prisoner of war on its territory, that they were all handed over to the United States following the conclusion of the Paris agreement on peace in Vietnam. Nevertheless, Vietnam welcomes the efforts by the U.S. side, including U.S. families, to participate in seeking and obtaining authentic information on soldiers missing in action.

Thanks to Vietnam's goodwill, since March 1974 a special U.S. mission has been searching for the remains of MIA's. The remains of 424 U.S. officers and men, presumed missing in action, have already been sent from Vietnam to America, for which U.S. families were deeply grateful to the Vietnamese people.

It was announced 1 November at an SRV Foreign Ministry news conference that there will be another stage of the conference of Vietnamese and U.S. experts in Hanoi 7-9 November. They will sum up the six [as published] years of work organizing the search for the remains of soldiers missing in action and map out a new phase of the search operation.

More and more new people and organizations are joining in the process leading to the reexamination of relations between the two countries.

Manila Criticizes Japan's Gulf Forces Plan

HK0811052390 Moscow in Tagalog to the Philippines 1300 GMT 7 Nov 90

[Commentary by Aleksander Vladimirov]

[Text] Just as the new Japanese ambassador to the Philippines is settling into his post, Manila newspapers have been assailing the Japanese Government's plan to send forces to the Persian Gulf. One of the first newspapers to criticize Japan was the MANILA CHRONICLE, which said that Japan's Armed Forces should be restricted to Japan.

Meanwhile the Japanese parliament has been mulling the government's proposal to dispatch forces, termed noncombatant, to the Middle East. The Japanese constitution, drawn up after the Second World War, opposes the deployment of Japanese troops outside the country. Even though the motive for sending troops to the Gulf is a fine one, since the aim is to help settle the conflict there, some Japanese, as well as Asian countries, take a dim view of such a move. There is a basis for these misgivings.

As the Japanese will have to decide on whether to send forces overseas, the National Defense Agency needs to rule on whether to declare Article 9 of the constitution invalid. This Article states that Japan can overrule the law which forbids the use of its Armed Forces in cases of international conflict. Sending such a mission composed of Japanese troops would flout the principle that allows Japan to have self-defense forces.

Japan experts are concerned about this issue, and they are looking not just at the crisis in the Middle East, but also at the political implications involved in streamlining Japan's Army. The National Defense Agency has formulated a forward-base defense whereby the Japanese Armed Forces are being prepared to engage in military activity outside the home territory.

The Army now has longer range missiles using the (iggy?) system, which is activated automatically, and it has antisubmarine planes. Besides modernizing its land forces, Japan is also planning to build aircraft carriers capable of sailing around the world. The modernization of Japan's Army will allow it to match the rapid deployment policy of the United States' Armed Forces.

Such a scenario, in which Japan may join the peacekeeping forces in the Persian Gulf, has been worrying the countries of Southeast Asia. Philippine Foreign Secretary Raul Manglapus has said that the entire region is closely scrutinizing Japan's plan to send troops to the Gulf. According to University of the Philippines Professor Alex Magno, a formerly militaristic country like Japan, which once engaged in expansionism among its neighbors, should carefully consider the feelings of the people in East and Southeast Asia. Magno says that if Japanese troops are sent to the Gulf, the hope will be that Japan's economic might does not lead to a resurgence of its military ambition.

Near East & South Asia

Primakov Assesses Arab Role in Gulf Solution

PM0811160190 London AL-SHARQ AL-AWSAT in Arabic 7 Nov 90 p4

[Interview with Soviet Presidential Council Member and "President Gorbachev's personal envoy" Yevgeniy Primakov by Igor Belyayev and Sami 'Amarah in Moscow; date not given]

[Text] [Belyayev] The optimism you expressed after your first visit to Baghdad surprised the whole world. Some people are now saying that that optimism receded at the end of your tour of Baghdad, Arab and Western capitals. Our question is: How do you assess the current situation in the region and Baghdad's position as expressed recently by its information minister? In your view, what change, if any, has occurred in Saddam Husayn's position in the period since your first visit to Baghdad?

[Primakov] I cannot say today that I have completely lost my optimism. Such a conclusion would probably be incorrect. I still believe that all available means should be used in the search for peaceful solutions to compel the Iraqi forces to withdraw from Kuwait. That condition must be fulfilled, without any violation, in any peaceful settlement. I still have not lost confidence in the possibility of achieving such a settlement, not even since my second meeting with Saddam Husayn.

In your question you express your expectations or assumption that optimism began to recede after the first meeting. That seems to be the view expressed by many papers, but I have not drawn any clear line. If we compare the first and second meetings with Saddam Husayn, we could say that the second meeting was more specific and, therefore, the impressions were clearer about the possibility of Iraq's withdrawing its forces from Kuwait.

I can also state quite simply that at the second meeting the question of Kuwait's being a part of Iraq was not raised. You have cited what the Iraqi information minister said. Every minister is free to make any statement he likes, but what is clear and certain is that the international community does not accept that.

[Belyayev] Could we say that U.S. Secretary of State James Baker's tour is, in one way or another, an extension of your mission?

[Primakov] I do not have such great self-esteem as to allow myself to say that Baker is continuing the work I have done. Nor can I describe the trips which I have made on the personal instruction of President Gorbachev as a Primakov mission. I said this to my friend Igor Belyayev in my interview with the "European Journal" [not further identified]. Even the ideas I was guided by fell basically within the context of the instructions I received from the president of the Soviet Union.

Secretary Baker is visiting the region in accordance with his own plan. I do not see what link there is between the two. I do, however, believe that James Baker's visit to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and other countries of the region and his meetings with Eduard Shevardnadze and other officials are extremely important. Apparently that visit will affect the U.S. decision. I hope that he will see for himself the possibilities of steering the issue toward a peaceful settlement and of taking steps along that course without resorting to extreme military means.

[Belyayev] Some see James Baker as a hawk who supports a military solution.

[Primakov] I do not like to classify people in the United States as hawks or doves. There is no basis for that. During my U.S. visit I noticed that there was a united position seeking Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait but views vary as to the possibility of achieving that through peaceful means.

[Belyayev] Three months have passed in which the Soviet position has been flexible to the point, some believe, of indecision, particularly when military participation with the multinational forces in the Gulf region is discussed.

How do you view the prosects of such participation? Is there any possibility of that happening, and, if the answer is no, why?

[Primakov] I agree with you that the Soviet position is flexible but it is consistent, firm, and quite principled at the same time. True there is such a thing as unprincipled flexibility, but there is flexibility based on principles, and that is what characterizes the Soviet position in my opinion. We have taken a principled stand condemning the Iraqi invasion, condemning Iraq's annexation of Kuwait, and calling for the restoration of the conditions which existed before the invasion. We have supported all the UN resolutions against Iraq and are adhering precisely to all those resolutions.

All that confirms that our position is characterized by clarity of objective and is principled and at the same time flexible, as you have said. That flexibility, however, does not mean that we reject the proposed tasks or that there are some among us who doubt these tasks or use them as a subject for bargaining. These tasks, in our view, can be summed up as the need for withdrawal of the Iraqi forces. That could be achieved not only by military means. We are trying peaceful means.

As regards military participation with the international forces, I cannot give a simple answer to that question. The Soviet constitution stipulates that the president has the right to declare war only if aggression is committed against the Soviet Union. Apart from that, in other cases a decision must be made by the Supreme Soviet (legislature) of the Soviet Union

Naturally, if emergency circumstances arose and a need emerged to send Soviet forces abroad, then the decision would have to be made by the Supreme Soviet, not by the prime minister or any minister, or even the president.

I do not deny here that the Afghan complex still exists and there are various tendencies which would not make such a decision easy to make if the matter were put on the agenda. That is another factor which prompts us to develop efforts for a way out of the situation and out of the crisis created by events and by Iraq's actions.

I must say at the same time that, in seeking peaceful solutions to the current crisis, we do not primarily take into consideration—I stress: we do not primarily take into consideration—our internal interests and the Soviet public opinion only. We simply realize that the military solution and the military option, which many speak of in "absolute" terms, could have tragic consequences for the Arabs, the region, and even the whole world.

I am not talking about the devastation here, which would be grave, nor about the number of casualties, which would be high. I am specifically saying that instability would affect many regimes and could drown the entire region. Such a situation could destroy balances that would save the region from drowning and prevent tragic results.

[Belyayev] How do you view the "Arab factor" which the Soviet leadership has again been talking about, particularly after your meetings with Arab leaders?

[Primakov] This question is both important and difficult. Let me first say that the interpretation appearing in the Arab countries, West Europe, the United States, and the Arab press of President Gorbachev's statements as meaning that all responsibility for a solution should be placed on Arab shoulders is incorrect. We mention the Arab factor because it is a primary and necessary factor, not because the Soviet Union wants to get rid of the burden of responsibility and wants the Arabs to shoulder that burden, or because it believes that it and the other Security Council and UN members cannot shoulder the whole burden.

No, that is not so. The international community is shouldering that burden, and we have the UN resolutions and possible future resolutions. I want here to emphasize the need for continuation of efforts through the United Nations, not in insolation from the international community.

It is now clear that when we speak of the Arab factor we mean reactivation of that factor in the light of recent attempts to promote a peaceful settlement, and the Arabs can do much here.

Some say that that could be achieved through an Arab summit conference that would not give Iraq an ultimatum but appeal to it to withdraw its forces in the interest of the Arab nation, because a military solution would not be in the interest of that nation.

Others say that would be impossible because at such a summit conference the Arabs would only raise their differences and achieve no results, because the line now separating the Arab states is already clear and deep as far as the position on the Iraqi actions in Kuwait is concerned. But that is not the only way or form of Arab action. Efforts could be made through bilateral or Arab League missions or delegations. Perhaps the Arab leaders could seek signatures for an appeal to Saddam to withdraw his forces from Kuwait. Perhaps all these ways combined are appropriate.

There is one other point I want to mention. Anyone who doubts the effectiveness of Arab summit conferences is actually taking an individualistic view and assuming that a meeting is going to take place tomorrow, whereas any conference must be preceded by bilateral and multilateral preparations during which one idea or another could be explored. I must say that the meetings I have had with officials in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Syria, and Iraq confirmed that nobody is against the idea of reactivating the Arab role. On the contrary, they emphasize the need for that at this current stage.

[Belyayev] President Husni Mubarak discussed this matter in his latest speech and, commenting on President Gorbachev's call regarding the Arab factor, said that Academician Primakov should reveal to us what he achieved during his meetings with the Iraqi president.

[Primakov] I really do not know what I could tell President Mubarak, because he knows the situation in the Arab region better than I and he holds all the cards, as they say, because he is the leader of the biggest Arab country. I still maintain, however, that the Arab factor is not confined to just holding an Arab summit conference.

[Belyayev] You have met with Custodian of the Two Holy Mosques King Fahd Bin-'Abd-al-'Aziz. How was that meeting?

[Primakov] That meeting made a splendid impression on me. That was my first meeting with the custodian of the two holy mosques, about whom I had heard a lot before he assumed the leadership of the kingdom. When he became king many people realized that the man assuming power was a king politically qualified to lead the kingdom. I must also mention here that he has a good grasp of details. During my meeting with him I realized that he is insisting on unconditional Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait without losing interest in a peaceful settlement.

King Fahd was kind and courteous to me. He inspires warmth in everyone who talks to him.

[Belyayev] How do you view the position of Saudi Arabia and the role it is playing in the region in connection with the current crisis?

[Primakov] Without underestimating the role of Iraq and without placing it in an opposite position to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and the other Arab states, I say that the kingdom is playing an important and effective role in the Arab world and, as Saddam Husayn told me, it enjoys the highest degree of confidence. That is what Saddam Husayn himself emphasized to me. The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia is also important in that it is the state which decided to invite the U.S. forces, out of fear of the possibility of an Iraqi invasion of its territory.

[Belyayev] How do you view the future of Saudi-Soviet relations and the prospects for developing these relations?

[Primakov] I was quite moved by what King Fahd and Prince Sa'ud al-Faysal said about the future prospects for our relations. They said that they believed that there are wide horizons for these relations. We share their view. I wish here to express my own personal satisfaction with the restoration of diplomatic relations between the two countries, and that is also the general view of the Soviet leadership. There had been some "blank spots" in our relations with the Arabs. We had no diplomatic relations with Saudi Arabia, but now these spots have disappeared and that, in my view, is in our interest and in the interest of the Arabs and Saudi Arabia. I think the future will witness strong relations and the development of economic relations. These matters were discussed and debated during the visit of the Soviet government delegation headed by Minister Katushev, who discussed various topics with Saudi businessmen. I believe that there will be extensive activity in the field of joint establishments.

[Belyayev] Going back to the situation in the Gulf region and the Soviet position, we would like to ask what steps the Soviet Union intends to take in the near future to force Saddam Husayn to withdraw from Kuwait?

[Primakov] I believe that it is still too early to talk about additional steps. The matter is still under discussion and the Soviet leadership and President Gorbachev are following developments in the region. There are open and secret consultations with various states. I believe that the possibility of pursuing a peaceful course has not been exhausted yet.

[Belyayev] How do you view your relations with Iraq? Is the Soviet leadership confident that Saddam Husayn will keep the promise he made to you about releasing the Soviet experts working in Iraq? Does the friendship and cooperation agreement signed with Iraq mean anything as far as the current situation is concerned?

[Primakov] We are now present in Iraq. Our embassy is operating there and contacts are proceeding normally. There are also 3,000 experts working in Iraq. At the same time, we are committed to the Security Council resolutions on economic sanctions.

As regards our relations, they are complex and cannot be viewed from one angle, but I am personally certain that the Iraqi leadership will honor its word about the return of the Soviet experts working there. I do not have the slightest doubt about that. What is meant here are the experts who have expressed a desire to return home. We estimate that 2,500 experts will return to Moscow by the end of this current November. As regards the others, they will stay. No one on our side will try to persuade them to return and no one on the Iraqi side will force them to stay.

I want to say in addition that a decision regarding the military experts has been made, in principle. Regarding this, I would like to mention the fact that the Iraqi side had forced a group of military experts to disembark from a Moscow-bound aircraft a few days before my arrival. Now that matter has been resolved, and Saddam has instructed his secretary to follow up this issue personally. So, the experts are leaving without obstacles.

As regards the friendship and cooperation treaty, I believe that if we were to abrogate it unilaterally we would not be able to play the part we are currently playing for a peaceful settlement.

[Belyayev] Do you not believe that with such a policy the Soviet Union might seem to others to be sacrificing its interests in the region, or showing an inclination to leave it, or perhaps appeasing other policies there?

[Primakov] I answer you with three no's: No, the Soviet Union is not sacrificing its interests. No, it has no intention of leaving the region. No, it does not appease other policies.

[Belyayev] To us, you seem to be back to your optimism. How accurate is that impression?

[Primakov] Let me say that, where optimism is concerned, I am not in favor of discussing it quantitatively like saying 90 percent, 80 percent, 60 percent, or zero percent.

I am not an advocate of such quantitative assessments. There is optimism which has no basis, optimism not based on reality, or imaginary optimism. I do not believe in any of these. There is moderate optimism, which takes into consideration all aspects of the issue, the complexities of the situation, its diversities and sometime backwards movement, without neglecting one's right in the future because one could come up against something which could do away with it. I am for that kind of optimism, but I am not for zero optimism or optimism which actually means pessimism.

[Belyayev] You have met twice with Saddam Husayn. How different were your impressions of the second meeting from your impressions of the first meeting? How different did you find Saddam Husayn's position from one meeting to the other?

[Primakov] I have already talked about that. Our discussions the second time were based on specific facts, whereas the first was one of speeches and past history. You want more, I know, but I will not add anything.

[Belyayev] Many changes are taking place in the U.S. arena, sometimes stormy, particularly in the election conflict between Republicans and Democrats. Will that affect the U.S. Administration's decisions and, consequently, the Gulf situation?

[Primakov] The U.S. internal situation tangibly affects U.S. decisions, but I refuse to take a single one-sided view of that, because of the varying tendencies and interests of the various groups.

You have mentioned the Democrats. They, mainly for political reasons, are opposed to the military option for settlement of the Gulf crisis, but President Bush has clearly opted for firm measures and that has increased his popularity. The picture here, however, still seems to vary.

[Belyayev] A final question. Is there any intention of continuing the mediation efforts and pursuing a solution to the Gulf crisis?

[Primakov] That does not depend on me. I have submitted the results to the president. If he issues further instructions then I will go back to the region. If not, then I will stay in Moscow.

TASS Cites Kuwaiti Defense Minister on Forces

LD0811175190 Moscow TASS in English 1717 GMT 8 Nov 90

[Report by TASS correspondent Viktor Lebedev]

[Text] Abu Dhabi November 8 TASS—The Kuwaiti Defence Ministry has completed the re-organisation and arming of two infantry brigades. One of them already took positions on the Saudi-Kuwaiti border.

Another two infantry brigades, which are being formed now, will soon be added to the multinational armed forces, Kuwaiti Defence Minister Shaykh Nawwaf al-Ahmad told the Bahrain AL-AYAM newspaper.

The newspaper reports today, with reference to the minister, that the Iraqi occupation army seized 650 Hawk missiles in Kuwait, which can hardly be used by it because their launching pads were damaged by Kuwaiti specialists. Before retreating, the Kuwaiti Army also destroyed an early warning station between al-Jahra and al-Matlaa settlements.

Al-Ahmad thinks that slender hopes for a peaceful settlement of the Gulf crisis are kept alive and this chance should be used to avoid bloodshed.

Al-Ahmad emphasised that Kuwait would not cede an inch of its territory and would not agree to talks with Iraq until all of the aggressor's troops are pulled out of the country occupied by it.

'Islamic Factor' in Policy on Iraq Noted

LD0811145690 Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 8 Nov 90

[Commentary by Oleg Shchedrov]

[Text] The crisis in the Persian Gulf has made the world take a closer look at the political phenomenon known as the Islamic factor. For most Western countries the Islamic factor is something foreign. In any case it does not affect their domestic scene. The situation in the Soviet Union is quite different. Oleg Shchedrov shares his thoughts on the issue.

The Soviet Union has unconditionally denounced the Iraqi aggression against Kuwait. However, it did not send its soldiers to the international force now concentrated in that part of the world. Moscow's official statements are not as militant as those now made by Washington. There's good reason for some observers to speak of the excessive caution of the Soviet leadership.

Let us try to find out the reasons for this caution. A considerable part of Soviet territory is occupied by Muslim regions, populated by scores of millions of people. National traditions, largely based on Islam, are actively revived there, just the same as in other parts of the country. If we add here the centrifugal tendencies characteristic of the Soviet Union as a whole, it becomes evident that attempts to use Islam as a political instrument might prove effective there.

And this not just a possibility. I recall the TV footage from Azerbaijan where portraits of Ayatollah Khomeyni appeared over crowds of demonstrators at the time of the greatest tension. Many experts say that Saddam Husayn is not at all a threatening figure in the eyes of a considerable share of the Muslim population of the Soviet Union. Like in other Islamic countries he is viewed as a defender of faith, (?just the same) as the late Ayatollah Khomeyni.

The popularity of these views should not be exaggerated, but they cannot be ignored, especially by the leadership of the country. I think this is one of the explanations for Moscow's special caution when it comes to statements on the Persian Gulf and especially practical steps. At the same time the peculiar situation in this country, besides restricting the freedom to maneuver it, opens up special opportunities for Moscow. The Soviet Union, increasingly cooperating with the West, is not absolutely alien to the Islamic and Arab world. This allows it to serve as a bridge in critical situations such as the current situation in the Persian Gulf.

It is not accidental that both sides to the conflict closely followed the visits to the region by Yevgeniy Primakov. There have been no visible signs of success of the mission of the presidential envoy. But if the mediating efforts will prove at least partially successful, Moscow's authority in the international arena will grow considerably, and on the domestic scene the Soviet leadership will add another point to its score which will also be quite helpful.

Afghan Islamic Leader Views Soviet POWs

PM0811123290 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Nov 90 Union Edition p 5

[Report by special correspondent V. Skosyrev, incorporating interviews with G. Hekmatyar, leader of the Islamic Party of Afghanistan, and an unidentified USSR Foreign Ministry staffer; date not given; under the rubric "Addendum to Previous Publication": "Hekmatyar Puts Forward Conditions"]

[Text] Islamabad, Moscow—Somewhere in the hills to the north of Kabul, in the hands of detachments of the rebel commander A. Masud, is a Soviet serviceman named Aleksandr who was taken prisoner. He was born in the Ukraine; his father is a Ukrainian and his mother an Azerbaijani. An Afghan Government representative saw him during meetings with the mujahidin, but was unable to learn anything else. Aleksandr does not figure in lists of living prisoners, and the Ministry of Defense possesses no information about any of our soldiers missing in Afghanistan to whom these data apply.

Nevertheless, there are grounds to suppose that Aleksandr is a real person. He is one of approximately 70-80 Soviet people who are alive and, according to our departments' evaluations, in the hands of the armed Afghan opposition. (There are about 100 of them according to Afghan Ministry for State Security data.)

The dispatch "Bitter Truth of the Recent War" (IZVESTIYA No. 298) relates what the Najibullah government is doing for their release.

But how does the opposite side in the conflict—the Afghan mujahidin—regard the problem of prisoners? What conditions is it putting forward for their return to the Motherland?

It was with the aim of clarifying these questions that I contacted by telephone Gulbuddin Hekmatyar, leader of the Islamic Party of Afghanistan, whose headquarters is situated in the Pakistani city of Peshawar. I am sure that Hekmatyar, of all people, must possess information on this subject. After all, according to some reports, up to 40 percent of the forces at war against Kabul are under his control.

But this most intransigent of rebel leaders was unwilling to give any specific information.

"There are a certain number of Soviet prisoners in detachments of the Islamic Party of Afghanistan. They are guests of the mujahidin. They will remain there until the Afghan problem is resolved," he stated.

The answer leaves scope for speculation. What does the word "guests" mean? After all, Iraqi President S. Husayn also calls hostages "guests." But at least one thing is obvious—Hekmatyar links the return of prisoners to a general settlement in Afghanistan. Therefore the rest of the conversation was devoted to this theme.

[Skosyrev] Is there a hope for national reconciliation?

[Hekmatyar] It is the fault of the Kabul regime, which was foisted on the country by the Soviet Union, that the war is continuing. We cannot forget that 1.5 million Afghans were killed by Russian weapons, and five million forced to leave the country. As for Najibullah, his regime will hold out for some time yet, but in the end it will fall. If the mujahidin were able to defeat Soviet troops, they can overcome Najib too.

[Skosyrev] But while the fighting goes on, innocent people are dying and the civilian population of Kabul and other cities suffers as a result of rocket bombardments.

[Hekmatyar] If the mujahidin wanted to attack cities, the regime in Kabul would not be able to withstand them. But we do not want to spill blood, so we are not launching an offensive on cities.

[Skosyrev] Is there an alternative to continuing the war?

[Hekmatyar] Until Kabul renounces power there is no alternative to resistance. After the fall of Kabul we will create a unified government and hold elections. The possibility of a peaceful settlement will arise if the Kabul regime is removed and replaced by people acceptable to the mujahidin. Figures from the present government are not acceptable to us, nor are figures who were in power before the April coup (of 1978—Skosyrev). The former king, Zahir Shah, also has no place in a postwar Afghanistan.

[Skosyrev] If Kabul falls, what fate will overtake the Afghans who are fighting against you?

[Hekmatyar] We will proclaim an amnesty for all those who cease fighting. But those who continue will be prosecuted.

[Skosyrev] What is your forecast concerning relations between Afghanistan and the Soviet Union?

[Hekmatyar] The character of future relations between our countries will depend on whether or not you continue to support the Kabul regime. If Moscow ends its interference in our internal affairs, respects our sovereignty and borders, and stops supplying Kabul with arms, this will help normalize our relations. We want to have good relations with Moscow. Conversely, if the support for the Kabul regime continues on your part, it will be difficult to preserve relations between our states. [Hekmatyar ends]

So much for the interview. You can, of course, regard it as bravada, propaganda. But whether we like Hekmatyar's remarks or not, the fact is that they reflect his supporters' views.

Of course, Hekmatyar is not the whole of the Afghan opposition. It is well known that relations between him and the other leaders of the parties belonging to the "Peshawar Seven" or the transitional government of Afghanistan are highly unstable, not to say hostile. Nonetheless even this association recently issued a statement similar to Hekmatyar's. In a press release issued by the transitional government's Information Ministry, the freeing of Soviet prisoners of war is made dependent on "a general change for the better in Russia's policy on Afghanistan." A demand is put forward, in particular, for an end to support for the Najibullah regime, the payment of war reparations, and the granting of freedom to all Afghan political prisoners.

The conditions, as we see, have been rigidly formulated. I asked a USSR Foreign Ministry staffer to comment on them.

[Unidentified Foreign Ministry staffer] First, I wish to stress that in putting forward these demands the Afghan armed opposition is in contravention of the norms of international law. This is a humanitarian issue, and it should not be made conditional on the achievement of an all-embracing political settlement in Afghanistan, that is to say on the solution of other aspects of the Afghan problem.

[Skosyrev] But in view of the tragedy experienced by Afghans when our troops were participating in the war, this argument will hardly convince the mujahidin....

[Foreign Ministry staffer] It is not right to paint all the leaders of the Afghan opposition in the same colors. For instance, S. Mojadeddi, president of the so-called transitional government, stated in a talk with our ambassador in Pakistan, V.P. Yakunin, that he himself advocates fulfilling the norms of international law regarding prisoners of war. Although none of our people are in Mojadeddi's detachments, according to him, he nevertheless has expressed himself in favor of other members of the transitional government also entering into talks with Soviet representatives.

However difficult such meetings are, we will not relax our efforts; to abandon our people who have fallen captive would be immoral. I would like to recall that our government has been raising this question at the highest level with the United States and Pakistan as participants in the Geneva agreements. We are in contact with other governments, with the International Red Cross Committee, and with international and Soviet social organizations. The Afghan Government is at our request actively involved in searches for prisoners of war, as your paper wrote.

[Skosyrev] But it emerges from statements by leaders of the Afghan opposition and conversations with them that the stumbling block, from their point of view, is our support for Najibullah, especially arms deliveries to him. Please explain why, in fact, having left Afghanistan, we still support its government with our power? Surely we are not obliged to do this?

[Foreign Ministry staffer] It is not a case of obligation, but a sober assessment of the situation. We must think, apart from anything else, of the security of our southern borders, and we are therefore committed to there being a friendly government in Kabul.

As for arms supplies, we propose to end them, but to end them completely, to all the warring Afghan parties and from all sources from which they are coming into Afghanistan today; otherwise the bloodshed in Afghanistan will continue, because the parties have accumulated sufficient weapons for this purpose. Unfortunately, so far neither Washington nor Islamabad has accepted this idea.

[Skosyrev] That means a deadlock situation has arisen. Perhaps informal initiatives can find a solution. For instance, B.N. Yeltsin has sent an invitation to the leaders of the mujahidin to visit Moscow for talks. What do you think about that?

[Foreign Ministry staffer] Any proposal which will help alleviate the plight of our prisoners can only be welcomed..

Future of Post-'Awn Lebanon Examined

91UF0121A Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 1 Nov 90 Second Edition p 3

[Article by I. Popov and A. Smirnov: "Killing at Dawn"]

[Text] The lifespan of a military rebellion in a small country is usually short. After a few days the leader of the rebels surrenders to the legitimate authorities or flees abroad, having laid his hands on several millions, or becomes president of the country. Lebanon's General 'Awn held on in the B'abda presidential palace for two years, in the course of which Lebanese citizens experienced sufferings and bore losses such as they had not known throughout the 15-year civil war. Having declared himself the defender and savior of the Christians, he made all of life hell primarily in the Christian neighborhoods of East Beirut and the adjacent districts.

Merely the general's unsuccessful attempts to eliminate the rival Christian military detachments of the "Lebanese Forces" caused losses in excess of $500 million and led to the death of several hundred Maronites and Greek Catholics. Approximately quarter of a million Christians left the country in the two years, and they do not now constitute even 40 percent of the population of this country. Thousands of Christian poor took refuge in Muslim-controlled West Beirut, where life in recent months had been safer.

It was possible for 'Awn's rebellion to last so long merely as a result of the extensive support on the part of outside forces. In the first months his main supplier of heavy weapons had been Iraq, which was endeavoring to weaken Syrian influence in Lebanon. Even earlier the Lebanese Army units consisting of Christians, which 'Awn had commanded as defense minister, had obtained hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of the latest military equipment from the United States.

Nor did Israel stint on weapons and military advisers for the right-wing Christian military formations, which up to the start of the present year had been the rebel minister's main ally. France and the Vatican bear considerable responsibility for the political and material support of 'Awn's rebellion. On a broader plane the entire last two-year segment of the civil war in Lebanon may be seen as a result of the narrowly selfish policy of the United States, Israel, and certain of their allies in respect of this Arab country.

Facts which have become known to all indicate that the recent "idol" of excited Christian youth of Lebanon was simply light-fingered. He deposited in his wife's account in a Paris bank 15 million rubles from profiteering in petroleum products and flour alone and he laid his hands on a further $20 million from Foreign Ministry resources.

What problems and new dangers face Lebanon's legitimate authorities following 'Awn's surrender? Despite the appeals of many of the country's authoritative politicians for the prevention of acts of revenge and reprisals against supporters of the rebel general, such actions are taking place. The list of those who have died as a result of violence against Lebanon's leaders has been supplemented by Dany Sham'un and members of his family.

The killing occurred on 21 October at dawn. On this Sunday morning three persons in the uniform of servicemen of the Lebanese Army entered the eight-story building in a suburb of the Christian part of Beirut. Several minutes later the purpose of their visit was accomplished: Using 9-mm handguns with silencers, they shot the owner of the apartment and his wife and their two young sons in cold blood, leaving just their 10-month-old daughter alive....

The 56-year-old president of Lebanon's National Liberal Party, Dany Sham'un, was undoubtedly not lacking in hostile attitudes toward his family both within the country and abroad. Coming from a most influential feudal family, the son of former president of the country, Camille Sham'un, and a leader of right-wing Christian forces who made a considerable "contribution" to the unleashing of the incessant civil war in Lebanon, now into its 16th year, he inherited many of his father's political views. As a fierce champion of preservation of the supremacy of the Christian community in all spheres of the life of Lebanese society without exception, D. Sham'un headed a bloc of political parties which actively supported the rebel general M. 'Awn, who was opposed to the presence of the contingent of Syrian forces in Lebanon, which had been committed there for the purpose of achieving a halt to the bloodshed between the contending groupings, and supported the ouster of President Ilyas Harawi, who had been elected by the country's parliament at the end of last year.

Hardly did the Palestinians either, hundreds of whose compatriots were barbarically slain eight years ago in the camps of Sabra and Shatila as a result of the criminal action which was perpetrated in conjunction with the Israeli Army by right-wing Christian extremists, harbor kindly feelings toward D. Sham'un. Nor did fighters of the right-wing Christian "Lebanese Forces," who had had long-standing feuds with armed formations of the National Liberal Party, have any less reason for settling scores with him.

Not one political force in the country has risked claiming responsibility for the killing of D. Sham'un. In addition, Lebanon's leaders, both Christians and Muslims, have unanimously condemned the action, but have differed as to who is responsible for it. Thus Prime Minister S. al-Huss and W. Junblatt, chairman of the Progressive Socialist Party, believe that D. Sham'un was the victim of a conspiracy on the part of the "Lebanese Forces" and other right-wing Christian formations which had not forgiven him for having commenced negotiations with the Harawi-al-Huss government after government troops and the Syrian forces had in the course of a joint operation forced General 'Awn's surrender. A spokesman for the National Liberal Party and S. Ja'ja', leader of the "Lebanese Forces," place responsibility for the assassination on the Syrians and the Lebanese Army controlling the B'abda neighborhood, where D. Sham'un's family lived.

Nonetheless, it may be assumed that the organizers of D. Sham'un's murder will, as in the case of the physical removal of Prime Minister R. Karami in June 1987, remain unknown. It is clear merely that the death of D. Sham'un is one further link in the chain of political murders aimed at a sharp exacerbation of the situation in Lebanon and used for this each time that signs of a normalization of the situation in the country emerge.

Here is just a brief chronology of the terrorist actions in respect of prominent politicians of the country which subsequently led to numerous human casualties. The assassination in March 1977 of Kamal Junblatt, leader of the Progressive Socialist Party, was carried out shortly after an agreement had been reached in Riyadh on a cease-fire between the belligerents in Lebanon. The clash between the Druze and Christian populations in Mount Lebanon provoked by this led to great human casualties. The physical extermination of Bashir al-Jumayyil, leader of the "Lebanese Forces," on 14 September 1982 served as the pretext for the Israeli invasion of West Beirut—the Muslim sector of the Lebanese capital. This was followed by the bloody massacre of the peaceful Palestinian population in Sabra and Shatila. On 16 May 1989 the assassination of mufti Shaykh Hasan Khalid, leader of Lebanon's Sunni Muslim community, led to even greater embitterment in relations between the Muslim and Christian zones. The powerful explosion which caused the death of President Rene Mu'awwad on 22 November 1989 buried the hopes of the Lebanese for the start of a peaceful dialogue between Muslim and Christian leaders which had emerged at that time.

The most urgent and complex task is the disbandment of the illegal armed formations and the liberation of the South Lebanon areas from Israeli occupation. These tasks are closely related. As a whole, Israel's positions in Lebanon have been shaken. Preoccupied primarily with the situation in the Persian Gulf, the United States cannot openly connive at the Israelis throwing their weight around on Lebanese territory. But the close military-political ties of the "Lebanese Forces" and Israel persist, and if the Lebanese Army embarks on disarming these formations, it should expect direct intervention on the part of Israel.

In addition, many armed groups of both left and Islamic schools are continuing the struggle against the Israeli occupation and the puppet army of South Lebanon. They set as the condition of their disarmament the Israelis' total withdrawal from the country's territory.

The Syrian military presence on Lebanese territory is based on the requests and appeals of several Lebanese presidents and legitimate governments and resolutions of the Lebanese Parliament. Syria has truly done much in its attempts to stabilize the situation in Lebanon and preserve it as a sovereign Arab country. Syria also has certain economic and political interests in Lebanon, and Beirut was, after all, for centuries the port of Damascus. There are also unresolved territorial issues, but it is wrong to accuse Syria of the intention of annexing Lebanon.

In the opinion of some specialists, there will in Lebanon's future be more order, but less democracy. The selfish interests of the contending party and religious forces will hardly destroy this beautiful country. To judge by everything, the system of the allocation of offices of state among the leaders of the different religious communities will become a thing of the past in connection with the adoption of constitutional reform. It is essential to strengthen the power of the head of government and the authority of the legitimate authorities as a whole.

U.S. Embassy's 1979 Takeover in Iran Recalled

NC0911124590 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Persian to Iran 1530 GMT 6 Nov 90

[Station commentary]

[Text] Eleven (?years) have elapsed since the 4 November incident when a group of Iranian students, followers of Ayatollah Khomeyni's line, occupied the American Embassy in Tehran and took the American diplomats hostage. This anniversary is usually marked in Iran by an escalation of a campaign between the conservative group, which is a proponent of the former policy of isolationism, and those who are in favor of the country's reconstruction and broadening of international relations and cooperation.

In such conditions of internal struggle, the Iranian mass media do not have a uniform attitude regarding the 4 November anniversary. The conservative publications stress that the present U.S. policy is a continuation of the previous U.S. Administrations' anti-Iranian policies. JOMHURI-YE ESLAMI and ABRAR remind the public to be alert to the plots of U.S. imperialism and project the United States as the enemy of Islam. Other publications focus less on pompous anti-American declarations and more on the analysis of factors preventing the elimination of the tension in Iranian-U.S. relations in the contemporary period.

It appears that the latter stance is more realistic. We should not let the period of Iranian-American confrontation be forgotten. That was a period when the cold war was still in progress and ideological, economic, and military conflicts between the East and the West, the North and the South had assumed unprecedented intensity.

In short, that period was one of confrontation. In international policies, the anachronistic thinking of the presence of an enemy and the need to resort to force was dominant. Under such circumstances, the disintegration of the Shah's regime, which claimed the role of an (?invincible) bastion in the region, was accepted in the

White House as a strategic loss. The (?new) Iranian regime supported the policy of confrontation between the East and the West.

Now the world has undergone a change. The mode of thinking based on support of confrontation has given way to a recognition of the importance of general human values and resolving issues by political means. Countries with varying superstructures and ideologies are seeking vistas for mutual cooperation and compromise. This is interpreted as a remedy for the legacy of the cold war era's interventionist policy.

In principle, life has made such changes possible. In past years, Soviet-Iranian relations in various fields have improved tangibly. Between the Soviet Union and Iran, a communique was signed on reciprocal ties and bilateral cooepration based on principles of amicable coexistence between countries with widely differing social structures.

Iran's policy regarding Afghanistan assumed a special form. Serious progress manifested itself in the normalization of Iran-Iraq relations. Of course, certain trends still persist which do not act in favor of peace and stability. Among these are the continued U.S. economic and political sanctions against Iran, the occupation of Kuwait by Iraq, and resorting to a policy based on force by Israel.

These realities mar the hopes of the peace-loving circles to revamp the world and to better it. In particular, the U.S. sanctions motivate the Iranians to continue their preconceived, traditional warnings against the U.S. policies. It is hoped that the two sides will adopt the new thinking and seek a way to extricate themselves from the present impasse.

West Europe

FRG's Genscher Greets Gorbachev, Shevardnadze

LD0911121190 Moscow TASS in English 1158 GMT 9 Nov 90

[Text] Bonn November 9 TASS—President Mikhail Gorbachev has arrived here today on a visit at the invitation of Chancellor Helmut Kohl.

Gorbachev is being accompanied by Eduard Shevardnadze, Stepan Sitaryan, Mikhail Moiseyev, Anatoliy Chernyev, Yuliy Kvitsinskiy and Valentin Falin.

At the airport the president and his entourage were greeted by German Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher, state-secretary of the federal president's office Andreas Meyer-Landrut and other officials.

The welcoming party included Soviet ambassador to Germany Vladislav Terekhov and German Ambassador to the Soviet Union Klaus Blech.

Although this is a working visit, its political significance is very high. This is Gorbachev's first visit to the united Germany and first visit to Germany as president of the Soviet Union.

Gorbachev is expected to sign a number of important agreements, including a treaty on goodneighbourly relations, partnership and cooperation.

These agreements will lay the foundation for large-scale cooperation between the two countries in the spheres of economy, industry, science and technology.

Genscher said earlier that relations between the Soviet Union and the united Germany would be more than a simple combination of the Soviet Union's relations with the two German states that existed before October 3, 1990.

During his stay in Germany, Gorbachev will visit Kohl's home region of Rhineland-Palatinate. Earlier, Kohl visited Gorbachev's home region of Stavropol, south Russia.

Such personal contacts help strengthen confidence and mutual understanding between the two countries.

Commentaries Preview Gorbachev's FRG Visit

Success of Reforms Desired

PM0811162690 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Nov 90 Union Edition p 1

[Article by IZVESTIYA correspondents Ye. Bovkun and A. Balandin: "Investments in the Future. Toward M.S. Gorbachev's Visit to the FRG"]

[Text] Bonn—Bonn has been understanding about the fact that the Soviet president is coming to Germany a few days later than planned. If this had happened during the epoch of stagnation, people here would have spent a long time surmising about the secret reasons for the delay and about a possible cooling of bilateral ties. No one is in any doubt now that these relations must improve, despite any difficulties we are experiencing while implementing the reforms.

The Germans probably feel all our problems even more acutely than the population of other West European countries. Foreign Minister H.-D. Genscher recently voiced concern in connection with the fact that "some people in the West" (unlike the Germans) detachedly observe the development of events in the East instead of actively helping. West Europe is not indifferent to the fate of the reforms of the former planned economies in the Soviet Union, Poland, or Czechoslovakia. At least, the FRG leaders do not want the demolished wall to be replaced by a deep ditch dividing people along lines of prosperity or lack of it.

Germany intends to promote the success of the reforms in the USSR by developing partnership and economic cooperation and handing over modern technology and "know-how." At the same time, as practically all our interlocutors repeatedly emphasized, it is certainly not a question of "gifts" but of investments in a joint future. For stability in Europe is assuming not only a military-political dimension. The continent also needs economic, social, and ecological stability.

How can this be achieved? The treaty of good-neighborliness, partnership, and cooperation, which will be signed in Bonn, enlarges on the previous agreements and enriches and adds to them. The prospect of these accords prompts no objections in either industrial or political circles.

However, the Germans are seriously concerned about the question of who will be their main partner: the central government or republican authorities?

On the eve of M.S. Gorbachev's visit to Bonn we talked with Eberhard Schneider, a Cologne scientist and lead associate of the Federal Institute for the Study of East European Countries and International Problems. This government-funded establishment advises the cabinet, the Bundestag, and political parties on the whole range of the problems which it studies and thus plays an important role in the process of shaping public opinion. How does the institute evaluate the state of Soviet-German ties?

"To a considerable degree," E. Schneider said, "we are obliged to Gorbachev's policy of new thinking for Germany's unification. And so it is perfectly natural that this united Germany with its potential is trying to help the Soviet Union to resolve its internal problems. This includes both financial assistance connected with the Soviet troop withdrawal from the territory of the former GDR and cooperation in the spheres of culture, science, and economics. At the same time, we are, of course, concerned about what will happen in the USSR: Will we be dealing with one partner or several?

"Of course, if the central authority in the USSR yields its powers to the republics, which will become a more important political factor, we will be obliged to adapt to that. But if it becomes firmly established thanks to the emergence of new structures—a confederation, let us say—we will conclude agreements primarily with it.

"But I wish to emphasize that we do not engage in politics and do not wish to influence the development of events in your country in any way. Our task is to adapt to them.

"I consider the new economic development program recently adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet to be quite flexible. From my viewpoint, President Gorbachev's program is a perfectly reasonable compromise, and he will be able to make specific amendments to it as things progress."

Planned Treaty Highlighted

PM0911114790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Nov 90 Second Edition pp 1, 5

[Report by special correspondents Ye. Grigoryev and V. Drobkov under the rubric: "Foreign News": "View from Petersberg Hill: The FRG on the Eve of M.S. Gorbachev's Visit"]

[Text] Bonn—From Petersberg, one of the peaks of the Siebengebirge hills along the Rhine, there is a magnificent panorama. On the left there is the jagged outline of a medieval castle. According to legend it was there, at Drachenfels, that Siegfried, hero of the German epic, slew the hideous monster. Down below you see the mighty mass of water of the river which the people respectfully call "old father Rhine."

On Petersberg there is an official residence for guests of the FRG Government. M.S. Gorbachev will arrive here from the airport. The main purpose of the Soviet President's second visit to the Rhine is to sign the Treaty on Good-Neighborliness, Partnership, and Cooperation between the USSR and the FRG. This document was prepared and initialed two months ago. So the signing ceremony itself will not take long.

Nevertheless, the eminent guest will not have time to admire the beauty of the Rhenish landscape. The schedule of the visit is packed. There are to be conversations and meetings with Federal President R. von Weizsaecker and Federal Chancellor H. Kohl and wide-ranging talks involving ministers and other representatives of the two sides. And the journalists accredited for the visit can expect a joint news conference between M.S. Gorbachev and H. Kohl after the signing of the treaty.

The bulk of the second and last day of the visit will be spent in the Rhineland-Palatinate. Chancellor Kohl, "responding" to his visit to Stavropol and the Caucasus, which greatly impressed him, will acquaint his guest with sights in his native land. There will be a visit to the ancient town of Speyer, which is now celebrating its 2,000th anniversary, the picturesque town of Deidesheim, one of the viticultural and wine-producing centers of the Palatinate, and Kohl's own home in the Ludwigshafen suburb of Oggersheim. The conversations there will mark the end of the day's political program which will resume at Petersberg with meetings with Foreign Minister Genscher and afterward with Social Democratic leaders.

"We attach great significance to President Gorbachev's visit," people in the Federal Chancellor's immediate circle are saying. "The Chancellor and the President have already agreed that they will sign the Treaty on Good Neighborliness, Partnership, and Cooperation themselves. In our view, this is an extremely important document. It places relations between the USSR and the FRG after German unification on a completely new basis. We want to symbolize by this document that we intend to develop relations with the Soviet Union which are as all-embracing and typical of partners as possible. In all spheres—from the economy and culture to ecology and youth exchange. This is our serious intention enshrined in the treaty."

"Another thing in which we are greatly interested," we heard in an office of the Federal Chancellor's department, "is that President Gorbachev's course should be maintained and crowned with success. The Federal Chancellor has noted a number of times that this is of fundamental significance not only for the Soviet Union but also for all of Europe, the whole world, and East-West relations in general. In this connection he favors giving real economic, technological, and other support to the course of reforms in the USSR. I think that the EC countries and the United States will soon be convinced of the need for such support."

Good wishes are being expressed for the visit and the new relations between our countries wherever you go here. Politicians and commentators are stating as much. The general state of and prospects for our relations are undoubtedly positive factors. At the same time, in practical cooperation, as in life, nothing is completely perfect. Take, for example, the trade and economic sphere. Unfortunately, the difficult processes of unifying the economies of the western and eastern parts of Germany and the introduction of the West German mark as the single means of payment are proving quite negative for Soviet interests. Cooperation bottlenecks will have to be resolved.

And, of course, even with the best relations and excellent contractual bases, the implementation of plans always needs attention and hard work.

This also applies fully to the sphere of cooperation in European and world politics. It is presumed here that the sides will exchange opinions on the Persian Gulf situation. The FRG is also seriously concerned about it. Hundreds of German hostages are being held in Iraq and W. Brandt, honorary chairman of the Social Democratic Party of Germany [SPD], is now in Baghdad trying to secure the release of at least some of them. It may be presumed that a significant part of the USSR president's visit will be taken up with European problems, the prospects for the forthcoming meeting of European heads of states and governments in Paris, and questions of disarmament and the creation of common European security structures.

So on Friday our state flags will fly from the flagstaffs in Bonn. But we would like to emphasize once more the attitude being shown toward our president and our country by many FRG citizens who wish perestroyka success and express a desire for the strengthening of trust and cooperation between the peoples of the USSR and Germany.

"It is our firm intention to cooperate with the Soviet Union, particularly in the economic sphere. In the sphere of culture and other areas where there are joint interests," O. Lafontaine, prime minister of the Saarland, deputy chairman of the SPD, and the party's candidate for the chancellorship, stated in a short interview for PRAVDA. "Therefore we will support the new USSR-FRG treaty and make our contribution to the development of German-Soviet friendship. The treaty will serve the rapprochment between Germans and the Soviet peoples. After all, this document is not only political but also economic. It envisages cooperation between people, and that is the most important thing for me, because world peace becomes more durable as rapprochement between people grows."

Finns Halt Payments, Cite Ruble Confusion

PM0811165190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Nov 90 Union Edition p 3

[Article by IZVESTIYA correspondent V. Shmyganovskiy: "Why Payments Were Halted"]

[Text] Helsinki—For the first time in nearly 40 years the Bank of Finland has not published figures for the relative value of the Soviet ruble and the national currency—the markka. Furthermore, all payments under the clearing trade arrangements between our countries have been halted. Why?

"To put it mildly, we have no idea what is going on in Moscow," Kari Holopainen, head of the bank's Eastern Trade Department, told journalists. "The introduction of a commercial rate for the ruble has not made it clear how, on what basis, we should now arrange our transactions. I have asked the USSR Bank for Foreign Economic Activity but have not received a reply...."

Nobody here seems to be surprised at the lack of response to business letters sent to the USSR. But the bank was indeed facing a problem: How to act. Until recently a ruble was officially exchanged for 6.5 markkas. The "tourist" rate, as you can see from items in IZVESTIYA, favored the markka (people will give you between three and five rubles for one markka on the black market). The introduction of a commercial rate totally confused Finnish bankers. They were not informed which of the three would be the definitive rate in determining the clearing rate for the ruble. It is clear, in K. Holopainen's words, that all this signifies a devaluation of the ruble. But many Finnish firms operating on the Soviet market are not protected against such a turn of events. For them this will mean a cut in their export revenue. This applies in particular to construction and metalworking companies. The total losses could be extremely substantial.

According to figures in the press, the volume of our trade in the first nine months of the year totaled 16.7 billion markkas ($4.6 billion), three-quarters of it in imports.

So payments have been temporarily frozen. Trade itself is continuing, of course: Freight is being delivered and talks are taking place. You can understand the avalanche of problems that has overwhelmed our bank at this time.

After the figures for our foreign debt were disclosed at government level the bank finds itself in the position of a man who cannot get his hands on three rubles before pay day. Nevertheless there is no justification for uncooperativeness toward business partners.

As for Soviet-Finnish relations, they are experiencing radical changes not only in the shape of the upcoming abandonment of barter trade but also in problem-solving methods. The Finnish side is increasingly letting the public give its verdict on things that used to be discussed behind the scenes. To the best of my knowledge the Finnish Foreign Ministry far from always welcomes such openness, believing that many questions are better resolved in the previous confidential manner.

But you can understand the bankers and firms' representatives: The removal of state control from foreign trade in the USSR robs it of its former aura of dependability. The Finns are now beginning to rely on glasnost as an instrument which provides some assistance in solving problems. IZVESTIYA has already written about our organizations' 700 million markkas of debts to Finnish firms in freely convertible currency.

Our partners' concerns are justified: A debt of even one million markkas could ruin a small or medium-sized Finnish company. The Finnish Central Industrial Union has even compiled a "black list" of debtors. Admittedly it is not intending to publish it yet. But this has been done in neighboring Sweden. The biggest debtor—owing 137 million Swedish kronor—turned out to be the "Prodintorg" association, which buys food products.

...Having failed to get an answer from the Soviet bank, K. Holopainen himself headed for Moscow.

"I would not want to overdramatize the situation," he said, "but there is a problem and it would be better to solve it more quickly."

A solution will be found, of course. But would it not be better to predict at least one step in advance the possible consequences of any given decision....

Hot News

As we were told by the Bank of Finland on 7 November, following consultations in Moscow it has been decided to resume payments. This means that the financial machine was shut down for almost a week.

Extradition Treaty With Finland Signed

LD0811185490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1138 GMT 8 Nov 90

[Report by TASS correspondent Arkadiy Prisyazhniy]

[Text] Helsinki, 8 Nov—In Helsinki today, the USSR and Finland signed a treaty under which persons sentenced to deprivation of liberty may be mutually extradited to serve their sentence. The treaty was signed by the USSR and Finnish ministers of justice Venyamin Yakovlev and Tarja Halonen.

The document stipulates that a criminal sentenced in one of the two countries to deprivation of liberty can, if he himself so desires, serve his sentence at home.

Finland is the first country in the West we have signed such an agreement with, said Yakovlev at the signing of the document. This is a humane document which meets the interests of people living in our two countries, and which will enable the effectiveness of the justice bodies in the two states to be increased.

At a news conference held after the signing, it was reported that three Soviet citizens are currently in finnish jails, while no Finnish citizens are in Soviet prisons.

The ministers told journalists about the results of a session of the Soviet-Finnish commission on legal questions, which ended today. Among the matters discussed were questions connected with the practical application of a Soviet-Finnish agreement on aircraft hijacks. The relevant officials were instructed to study all the problems associated with its implementation and, if the need arises, to draw up proposals for changes and additions to it.

Finnish Commander Questioned on Ties, Draft

PM0811112190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 7 Nov 90 Single Edition p 3

[Interview with Admiral J. Klenberg, commander in chief of Finland's defense forces, by correspondent Major M. Zheglov; place and date not given: "Admiral J. Klenberg: Our Relations Are Very Good!"]

[Excerpts] A great deal links us with Finland. Maybe considerably more than divides us. But what of military matters? What do our armies have in common, and how do they differ from each other? What problems does the army of our closest neighbor face? Our correspondent put questions about this and about much besides to Admiral J. Klenberg, commander in chief of Finland's Defensive Forces, who recently paid an official visit to the USSR.

[Zheglov] Admiral, how would you yourself evaluate your visit: as a courtesy call or as a means of resolving specific tasks?

[Klenberg] My visit is more than a simple courtesy call. It continues the contacts between our countries' Armed Forces which have been developing successfully for many years. Even though the visit program did not provide for any talks to be held.

[Zheglov] Quite good relations exist between the Armed Forces of the USSR and Finland. Military delegations and warships regularly exchange visits. But maybe it would be worth seeking some new forms of contacts between our countries' servicemen?

[Klenberg] I would like to say that relations between our armies are not just quite good but very good! We, in Finland, could not wish for better. As for seeking new forms of contacts, I have nothing against that. Personnel meet one another during visits by ships and air subunits. Such meetings take place according to the normal rules of human contact. And we will continue working in that direction. [passage omitted]

[Zheglov] Do any problems arise with the draft because Finland's Armed Forces are manned on the basis of compulsory military service?

[Klenberg] We have no such problems. But it is a worrying fact that there is a growing number of young people who cannot be drafted into the army for medical reasons. There is also a small number of people who refuse to take up arms on ethical and religious grounds. They make up approximately two percent of the total of draftees. They are used in civilian service lasting 16 months.

[Zheglov] Do those who refuse serve near their homes or are they distributed throughout the country?

[Klenberg] Throughout the country. [passage omitted]

NATO Commanders To Visit 'Mid-November'

LD0811133290 Moscow TASS in English 1245 GMT 8 Nov 90

[Text] Moscow November 8 TASS—It was officially announced here today that, as mutully agreed, Lieutenant-General Vigleik Eide, chairman of the NATO Military Committee, and General John Galvin, supreme allied commander, Europe, will pay an official visit to the Soviet Union in mid-November.

Supreme Allied Commander Interviewed Before Visit

LD0811162990 Moscow TASS in English 1602 GMT 8 Nov 90

[By TASS correspondent Valeriy Shashkov]

[Text] Casteau November 8 TASS—In the run-up to his visit to the Soviet Union, General John Galvin, Supreme Allied Commander in Europe, was interviewed by TASS at the supreme headquarters of the Allied powers in the Belgian city of Casteau.

"I am very much looking forward to the visit for a number of reasons, of course," Galvin said. "It will be my first chance to see a country about which I have heard a lot. I know such Russian authors like Tolstoy and Dostoyevsky. From a military point of view—because I have studied the Soviet Union as a soldier for most of my career but, above all, I am looking for the opportunity to speak to everyone I can about my ideas and to listen to other ideas from people there."

Speaking about changes in the military and strategic situation in Europe, Galvin emphasised that "the signing of the conventional arms treaty is a major concrete step" in this process.

"We will see a reduction in systems of military equipment for war. This will mean also a reduction of a level of confrontation that has existed for a long time between the two sides. Therefore, I believe, we will have taken the most important step that we can take toward a protected peace in Europe," Galvin stressed.

"It was very clear when President Gorbachev made a speech in the United Nations in December, 1988, that ideology will no longer be the basis for relations among nations, and that there will be a new thinking and a new approach to such things as the sufficiency of the defence. The signing of the Vienna treaty is a major concrete step in a direction which began, I think, with President Gorbachev's comments made in this speech," Galvin said.

"I believe that first of all we need a matrix of treaties, which clearly provide the concrete basis for a relationship in terms of security. By this I mean INF treaty, the conventional treaty, the SNF treaty. I mean the start of negotiations about long-range nuclear weapons. I mean also the attempts that we have been making that, I hope, will be successful in the future—with chemical weapons treaty.

"And I would like the other possibilities of the future to continue along these lines. This provides the basis, I think, for a good security relationship. However, treaties depend on organisations, and I believe that, for example, we still need the Conference on Security and Cooperation and we still need NATO," Galvin stressed.

Asked what opportunities were opened by contacts between representatives of the Armed Forces of NATO and the USSR, Galvin said: "I came to think sometimes about problems the way we would think of a log-jam on a river where many logs are sometimes cut up together and there is no movement, and they form a block. But sometimes by the removal of just one or two small logs the rest begin to move again.

"Sometimes, we military discuss some of the questions which, perhaps, do not reach the highest levels of political considerations. But, in fact, there may be more questions of rather lower level, but I pick up those small logs in the mess of wood that will not move, and when you pull out these logs—then things progress. May be in our discussions we can find some of these logs," Galvin said.

Archangel Mayor Attends Nuclear-Free Zone Talks

LD0811140190 London PRESS ASSOCIATION in English 1226 GMT 8 Nov 90

[Text] The mayor of Archangel, the first city in the Soviet Union to declare itself a nuclear-free zone, was in

Glasgow today. He was among representatives from about 20 countries attending the fifth international conference of nuclear-free zone local authorities. Delegates will visit nuclear bases and potential nuclear accident sites during their four days in Scotland.

Italian Party Paper, PRAVDA Group Meet

PM3110101790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Oct 90 Second Edition p 5

[Report by S. Oposhnyanskiy: "Visiting Us"]

[Text] For several decades the PRAVDA editorial office has received as its guests the distributors of the press of the foreign countries' communist and workers parties.

These are people of various professions who in their free time distribute their party's newspaper and talk with people, defending a particular view of present-day topical problems.

Distributors of the newspaper L'UNITA who had come from various provinces of Italy were guests of the editorial office recently. During talks in the editorial office they asked many questions concerning the situation in our country, the transition to market relations, help for the children of Chernobyl, our newspaper's difficulties, and ways of winning readers.

During their stay in Moscow the delegation members learned that the Nobel peace prize had been awarded to M.S. Gorbachev. "Thanks to the Soviet leadership's new policy," Franco Maggi, a communist from Genoa, said, "we can speak of the stabilization of the world situation and the ending of confrontation between the two great powers of the present day."

The meeting at PRAVDA has ended. As a reminder of it our friends were photographed at the editorial office entrance.

In addition to Moscow the Italian guests visited Kiev and Leningrad.

Statement Issued on Antall's Return to Work

LD0811134490 Budapest MTI in English 1052 GMT 8 Nov 90

[Text] Budapest, November 7 (MTI)—The Prime Minister's Press Office announces:

Prime Minister Jozsef Antall started work again on November 5.

It was the prime minister himself, who insisted on a detailed medical report being released on his state of health, contrary to the usual practice in Hungary. Being in such a responsible position, the premier thinks it vital to keep the public informed of such matters.

Supreme Soviet

Supreme Soviet Encounters Inertia, Old Approaches

PM0711140590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Nov 90 Union Edition p 2

[Report by P. Golub: "Draft Law on Free Entry and Exit Could Be Finalized in Next Few Weeks"]

[Text] I got the impression from the USSR Supreme Soviet International Affairs Committee session which was held Thursday 1 November that, in addition to purely lawmaking activity, the people's deputies must constantly overcome the inertia of yesterday and demonstrate over and over again that the forms, style, and methods of work that recently satisfied everyone are not suitable today for resolving even simple tasks. Judge for yourself.

At the session the deputies had to examine the foreign economic section of the USSR State Plan of Socioeconomic Development for 1991 and the finalized draft law on the procedure for citizens' exit from and entry to the USSR. Right at the start of the session A.S. Dzasokhov, who was in the chair, reported that the section of the state plan which had to be examined had been received from the Council of Ministers only the previous day and "at a late hour," according to the good old tradition. So the committee members had to virtually "sight-read." Maybe this had a considerable influence on the submission of their final verdict: to reject the proposed draft and propose that the government draw up a new document taking the deputies' assessments and proposals into account.

The Supreme Soviet committee adopted that decision despite a detailed and frank report by the representatives of: the USSR Council of Ministers, I.D. Ivanov; the USSR State Planning Committee, N.A. Lisovskiy; and the Bank for Foreign Economic Activity, V.V. Lyulchev. The assessments and forecasts made by these senior officials could not fail to be of concern to the deputies. Next year our exports really are expected to fall to 40 billion rubles [R], of which approximately R12.5 billion will go to pay off our foreign debt commitments. Supplies of our oil to the foreign market will be approximately halved and will amount to just 61 million tonnes. In all, just R12 billion will be left for import purchases, and this must be shared among the center, the republics, local authorities, and enterprises.... But no room was found for constructive proposals either in the document or in the statements by representatives of government organs.

Many questions were put to the main speakers. For example, about the reasons for the sharp drop in oil extraction in our country and about the measures planned to increase it (no reply ensued). About income from arms exports (no reply was heard either). About how the 10 billion foreign currency rubles allocated earlier by decision of the Supreme Soviet for urgent purchases of consumer goods abroad turned "imperceptibly" into one billion (in my opinion, the reply satisfied far from all the deputies).... In general, the committee decided not to recommend the foreign economic section submitted by the government for examination in the Supreme Soviet.

During the discussion of the entry-exit draft law the committee members once again encountered a phenomenon more characteristic of yesterday. Despite the fact that this law has now been under discussion for more than one month, guarantees of its fulfillment have still not been drawn up: It is still not clear how to facilitate the exchange of currency, to provide transport for those departing, to simplify and accelerate registration at the Visas and Registration Department.... Therefore certain statements voiced a quite firm demand that ways to overcome these obstacles should be thought about in the very near future.

As F.M. Burlatskiy, who submitted the draft law, declared, two unresolved questions have to be tackled at the Supreme Soviet session: the procedure for departure abroad by servicemen and persons liable to be drafted for military service; the property rights of citizens going abroad to take up permanent residence. In other respects the law can be finalized within the next few weeks and submitted to the session for approval.

A more acritical assessment of the draft law was made by Yu.Kh. Kalmykov, who spoke on behalf of the Supreme Soviet Legislation Committee. In his opinion, the law is not yet ready and contains many juridical flaws. A.M. Yakovlev had the final say. He agreed with the need to finalize the draft law but urged the deputies not to make ever-increasing demands on it and to examine it in the context of all our legislation. As a result, it was decided to recommend the long-awaited law for submission at the present session.

Toward the end of the session the members of the International Affairs Committee had to demonstrate once again that they have decisively abandoned the former work methods. A small question—about the sending of delegations of deputies to the disarmament talks in Vienna and Geneva—provoked a lively debate. Only yesterday the candidacies for these trips proposed by A.S. Dzasokhov would probably have been approved automatically, particularly as it was a question of authoritative people's deputies. But the committee members disagreed with the "secretly compiled lists" and proposed a more careful approach to preparing the delegations, including in them not so much deputies "respected by all" but, chiefly, specialists in disarmament issues.

Political & Social

Monarchists Hold Unlawful Moscow Demonstration

LD0811131590 Moscow TASS in English 1302 GMT 8 Nov 90

[By TASS correspondents Igor Agabekov and Vyacheslav Akimov]

[Text] Moscow November 8 TASS—A group of young people from the Russian Vityaz (Knight) Monarchist Union held a demonstration in Moscow today to pay tribute to "White Guard" anti-Soviet troops killed by the Red Army.

About 40 monarchists, wearing uniforms of the pre-revolutionary army, walked through central Moscow under the white-blue-red flag of the Russian empire, with a black two-headed eagle agianst the yellow background—the symbol of the tsar's family—in the upper corner.

The demonstrators held a mourning service near the Ascension Cathderal and laid a wreath at a former Mansion of Prince Gagarin, near which military cadets and revolutionaries clashed in fierce fighting in October 1917.

The building, situated outside TASS headquarters, now houses a movie theatre.

A ribbon on the wreath had the inscription "eternal memory to white heroes".

TASS was told at headquarters of the "Velikiy Posad" historical and patriotic society that the demonstration had not been allowed by the Moscow City Council. Nevertheless, police did not interfere.

KYODO Claims Soviet Union To Change Name

OW0811144490 Tokyo KYODO in English 1422 GMT 8 Nov 90

[Text] Moscow, Nov. 8 KYODO—The Soviet Union will drop the words "Soviet" and "Socialist" from its current name of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, or USSR, according to an official document obtained by KYODO NEWS SERVICE on Thursday.

The new name of the Union is to become the "Union of Sovereign Republics," official sources said.

The eight-page draft also will call for creating the post of vice president and introducing a new cabinet and federal judiciary system.

It also will replace the Congress of People's Deputies with the two-chamber "Federal Supreme Congress."

The draft is attached to a 12-page document entitled, "New Conception of the New Pact," with the signature of President Mikhail Gorbachev.

The sources said the document has been distributed to a draft committee consisting of representatives from all 15 Soviet republics. It will be made public by November 15.

The new pact to be concluded by the republics does not impose any obligation upon them to join the new Union, the sources added.

According to the draft pact, sovereignty will reside with affiliated republics, which are permitted to join the new Union in all equal positions.

As for the current Constitution, the national emblem and national anthem, it plans to renew them, while keeping Moscow as the union's capital and Russian as the official language.

The pact will come into effect upon approval and will be valid for 50 years. At the same time, the present federation pact that was enacted in 1922 will expire, the sources said.

Man Who Fired Red Square Shots Arrested

LD0811203590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 8 Nov 90

[Report from correspondent A. Korotkov from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] As we already reported, at 1110 yesterday, about a quarter of an hour after the Red Square demonstration began, two shots were heard. Nobody was hurt. The person who fired the shots has been detained. Who is he? We present a video report made available by TASS.

[Begin recording] [Korotkov] Yesterday's shooting incident in Red Square has been the object of many false interpretations by the Soviet and foreign press. In order to obtain first-hand information, so to speak, we visited the investigation department of the KGB to meet the investigator handling the case. In doing so, we received kind assistance from the KGB Public Relations Center.

Petr Aleksandrovich Sokolov, would you please tell us what has been discovered since yesterday?

[Sokolov] As the viewers already know, the man who attempted to commit an act of terrorism was detained in Red Square yesterday around noon. I have studied the preliminary materials that have been submitted. As a result I have instituted criminal proceedings under Section 2, Article 15, and Section 1, Article 66, of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Criminal Code. In other words he has been charged with attempting to commit an act of terrorism.

The individual responsible is Aleksandr Anatoliyevich Shmonov. He was born in 1952 and comes from Leningrad. He used to work as a fitter at the Izhora Works. Of late he is unemployed. Under interrogation as a suspect, Shmonov testified in detail about his preparations to commit a crime, about how he carried them out. Thanks to the efficient action of law enforcement employees the crime was thwarted. Nevertheless, Shmonov managed to fire two unaimed shots from his sawed-off, double-barrel shotgun.

Authorization to hold Shmonov in custody was received today from Comrade Dzenitis, USSR deputy procurator general. We will endeavor to investigate objectively the reasons and circumstances that prompted Shmonov to carry out this crime. [end recording]

PRAVDA Summarizes Nation-Wide 7 Nov Events

PM0811161490 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Nov 90 Second Edition p 2

["PRAVDA Correspondents' Reportage on Celebrations in the Country" collated by V. Khalin: "Toward Civil Peace and Concord"]

[Text] It is 73 years since the victory of the socialist idea was proclaimed in our country. Great October can be viewed and interpreted in different ways. But for all the diversity of opinions and all the divergence of convictions it remains an irrefutable fact that the fighters of the great revolution fought and died, and went through deprivation, joy, and disappointment for the lofty ideals of humanism and social justice and for land, freedom, and peace....

It is not their fault that the masses' noble impulse was distorted. As we agonizingly extricate ourselves from the shackles of the administrative edict system all of us, collectively and individually, clearly realize that the dream of building life in accordance with justice has never died and never will.

So the light of October will never go out. This is our history. It cannot be altered. On the other hand we can learn lessons from the past and not allow old mistakes at a new stage in history, the perestroyka stage. Unfortunately there are attempts to "repeat the past." We can again hear calls to raze everything to the ground and then....

Then there could be renewed destruction. Creation requires civil peace and concord. They are not easily achieved. Nevertheless society's healthy forces are consolidating—and this is the main source of hope today....

Over to our PRAVDA correspondents in the localities.

N. Volynskiy reports from Leningrad: The city of three revolutions is not celebrating the 73d anniversary of Great October in the best period of its history. Social tension has increased and the living standards of many categories of working people have declined. Indeed, can the "average" Leningrader afford to buy a kilogram of beef for 30 rubles or a kilogram of liver for 40? These are the prices on the market nowadays.

Nevertheless there is no despondency in the city. The forces of destabilization did everything they apparently could to spoil the day of October celebrations and keep people away from the traditional celebratory demonstration. But Communists, members of the Komsomol [Communist Youth League], war and labor veterans, and members of many social formations got Leningraders to come out and join the demonstration.

The Soviet anthem rang out over Palace Square and the military parade began. Soldiers marched past in serried ranks, the engines of combat equipment roared. B. Gidaspov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Leningrad Party Obkom [oblast committee]; A. Sobchak, chairman of the Leningrad City Soviet; A. Shchelkanov, chairman of the gorispolkom [city soviet executive committee]; and other leaders were on the rostrum.

The festive rally began. Unfortunately a handful of youths between 14 and 17 years old, manifestly the worse for drink, attempted to cause an affray. The "team" of hooligans was headed by Leningrad City Soviet deputy A. Rodin. The troublemakers were restrained. The columns of demonstrators moved slowly past. "We Need the Market but We Also Need Protection for Working People!"; "From Political Ambitions to Civil Accord!"; "Lenin's City Must Be a Fine City!"—these were the kinds of slogans carried by Leningraders.

After the square emptied an alternative column entered. It had been put together by the Democratic Union party. It is not difficult to guess that the demonstrators were carrying slogans denigrating October, our history, Communists, and perestroyka. This left a bitter taste in the mouth, but it did not stop the celebration being a celebration. In the evening there was a firework display over the Neva.

In the Ukrainian capital, M. Odinets and I. Tikhomirov report, there was a parade of Kiev Garrison troops in Victory Square yesterday. The public cordially greeted the participants in the parade, and only 50 or so thugs gathered on the roof of a building recently handed over to Rukh [Ukrainian People's Movement for Perestroyka] chanted "shame" extremely tediously in voices transformed into desperate squawks.

The celebratory demonstration began with a solemn meeting by the Lenin monument. Then columns of working people's representatives filled Kreshchatik. The parade was started by S.I. Girenko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee; L.M. Kravchuk, chairman of the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet; other republic, city, and Kiev Oblast leaders; revolution, Great Patriotic War, and labor veterans; and participants in Kiev's liberation from the Hitlerite onslaught 47 years ago on 6 November 1943.

There were no triumphant orations. Production results are more and more modest with every passing month, unfortunately. And this is naturally impacting on the political situation. "Enemies" are being sought increasingly actively, and far-out extremism is making itself felt.

Above the column the slogan "No to Nationalism!" stood out. Representatives of over 100 nationalities live in the Ukraine. And among the demonstrators Ukrainians, Russians, Jews, and Poles walked together in harmonious ranks. "Only in a union of sovereign socialist republics is the Ukrainian people's free development guaranteed!" was the celebratory call that resounded over Kreshchatik.

Unfortunately, in Bogdan Khmelnitskiy Square, where representatives of self-styled democratic parties gathered, expressions of a different kind and inflammatory appeals were to be heard.

V. Drozd called from Lvov. Despite the authorities' opposition, the city saw a celebration meeting and a military parade, whose participants were warmly greeted.

The October celebration in Minsk was unusual this year, A. Simurov notes. You could feel the atmosphere of tension in the Belorussian capital, whose citizens looked unfestively grim. The explanation is simple. For the first time two opposing forces—representatives of working people and official party and state bodies together with the Army, on the one hand, and the Belorussian People's Front on the other—were participating openly in the festivities with the city authorities' permission. The celebrations were separate because a special decision sent them to different assembly points at different times. There were also sharp differences in the appeals made to the rally participants.

In the morning in Lenin Square, where a parade of Minsk Garrison soldiers took place, the working people's representatives who filled the sidewalks around the columns of soldiers heard calls for consolidation and unification and wishes that the difficulties in the economy, politics, and the spiritual sphere will be combatted by joint efforts.

By contrast, the Belorussian People's Front representatives who gathered in Yakub Kolas Square called for the October jubilee to be marked as a "day of remembrance of the victims of communist dictatorship," "fiddling while Rome burns," and "the end of the era of communism." From here the Belorussian People's Front supporters moved through the center of town to Lenin Square, where they finally held their rally.

Alma-Ata was decorated more severely and frugally, without the extravagance of the past, G. Dildyayev and T. Yesilbayev report. Above the main square, recently renamed Republic Square (hopefully the last in a series of name changes), a poster reading "Loyalty to the Socialist Choice Is the Path to Progress" was visible from a long way off.

We will not distort the truth: Not everybody shares this view, but for the overwhelming majority of Kazakhstanis it has very definite meaning. First and foremost it is a philosophy.

There were both a military parade and a demonstration in Alma-Ata yesterday, and also a carnival to the extent that the determinedly autumnal weather allowed.

"Without traditions, it is not a people, it is only a population," teaching veteran Sh. Akimbekova told us. "October's red-letter days cannot be erased from people's lives and memories. That is why I am here in the square. And I am glad to see my students here too."

As happened in the old days, labor gifts were prepared for the October anniversary. By the old standards, the record crop harvested by Kazakhstan's grain growers, in fact the biggest in history, would have been the pretext for no end of crowing.... This year there was no crowing. But it would be criminal not to congratulate the farmers on such a success.

As in former years, Tashkent donned festive attire, V. Artemenko reports. Representatives of the labor collectives came to V.I. Lenin Square from all parts of Uzbekistan's capital for the festive march, and after the parade of Tashkent Garrison servicemen they marched past the monument to V.I. Lenin.

Among the festive columns I inquired about people's mood in coming to the square.

K. Rustanova, a die cutter at the "Orzu" association: "Before the holiday Tashkent Oblast stallholders and the consumer cooperatives did us proud. There were fairs everywhere, and we could buy excellent potatoes, meat, and fruit freely, without waiting in line. So our tables will be festive."

A. Ganikhanov, aircraft association party committee secretary: "Most of the many thousands of people in our collective are Russian speakers. At a recent session of the republic Supreme Soviet Uzbek President I. Karimov stated that discrimination will never be applied against any resident, whatever his nationality."

Tbilisi. It was decided not to hold demonstrations or processions here in connection with the 73d anniversary of October, G. Lebanidze writes in his report. The military parade took place at a guards' subunit and Great Patriotic War veterans and servicemen's families were invited to attend. The collectives of enterprises and institutions worked their normal timetable. The fact is that the day before the local press had published a statement by the Confederation of Independent Georgian Trade Unions board, deeming it inadvisable to celebrate the October Revolution anniversary.

Thousands of people carrying red flags came onto the streets of Vilnius, says a wire from Yu. Stroganov. The day before there was a meeting celebrating the 73d anniversary of October at the House of Political Education attended by members of the city's public and Soviet Army veterans. M.M. Burokevicius, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU) Central Committee, was there.

On the morning of 7 November M.M. Burokevicius, other leaders, and veterans laid flowers at the V.I. Lenin monument. Troops of the Vilnius Garrison paraded on Gediminas Avenue. Despite the moral pressure exerted on the supporters of the socialist idea, the attendance was no smaller than in the past. It was clear from their mood that the festival was still close to their hearts. A rally and demonstrations took place in the city.

Z. Kadymbekov reported from Baku that the Azerbaijani capital celebrated the October anniversary colorfully, but not as extensively as in the past. The city was decked out in red calico and the Baku Soviet had a joint meeting with the public and troops of the local garrison. Yesterday morning saw the splendid naval parade by the ships of the Red Banner Caspian Flotilla. Republic President A. Mutalibov congratulated the seamen on the festival.

There was no demonstration after the parade: It was canceled by order of the city commandant.

There was a call from Kishinev. A. Pasechnik was on the line. There are no traditional festive decorations in the republican capital's main square, which now bears a different name—Grand National Assembly Square. The usual October celebrations did not take place there either.

People began laying flowers at the monument to V.I. Lenin in the morning.

The local authorities decided not to hold a military parade and demonstration because of the very complex social and political situation. The population of Moldova is only just recovering from the recent tragedy in Dubossary. An enormous crowd gathered there yesterday when the victims of the bloody clash were buried.

There was an all-city meeting on 6 November in Kishinev to celebrate the 73d anniversary of October. Similar meetings were held in labor collectives. Yesterday, I was told, there were celebratory demonstrations in Tiraspol, Bendery, Rybnitsa, and other parts of the Dnestr area.

Yerevan. In accordance with a republic government resolution, TASS reports, there were no 73d anniversary of October festivities here. There was no military parade and no demonstration in the city. But 7 and 8 November were still holidays.

PRAVDA correspondent O. Meshkov reports from Riga. The townspeople celebrated the festival in the traditional place—on the Daugava embankment, near the platform that bears a bas-relief of V.I. Lenin. The absence of banners and placards on buildings did not affect the festive mood of those participating in the demonstration. There were very many people wanting to voice solidarity with the socialist choice for the development of Soviet society and the ideas of perestroyka.

After the military parade, held in accordance with the decree by the country's President and in defiance of a negative decision by the republic's parliament, thousands of Riga people gathered near the grandstand.

Unanimous applause greeted the speech by A. Rubiks, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee—an expression of support for the republic's entire party organization.

A message from Yu. Razgulyayev in Frunze. There were many doubts in Kirghiz party committees on the eve of 7 November: How were they to celebrate the festival? Hold a demonstration? The doubts were resolved by the labor collectives of the republic's major industrial enterprises. At the V.I. Lenin machine building association, the agricultural machine building plant, and the "Kirgizelektromash" production association workers firmly stated that all those not on shift would be in the procession.

But the number of people on the platform by the monument to V.I. Lenin was unusually small. Only the republic's top leaders, headed by recently elected President A. Akayev, greeted the demonstrators.

The state of emergency and curfew are still in place in Dushanbe, L. Makhkamov reports. But the republic's Supreme Soviet decided, in view of the mood of the city's inhabitants, to meet them halfway: Yesterday a television report on the military parade and working people's demonstration was broadcast throughout the republic.

The march-past by troops and military equipmnent on V.I. Lenin Square was followed by columns of demonstrators.

In the East they cherish their traditions, both ancient and modern. The October Revolution opened up for the peoples of Central Asia the path to modern civilization and helped them get on equal terms with the other peoples. This is not forgotten in Tajikistan, and people honor their recent history, although it does not please everyone any longer.

How did the celebrations go in Turkmenistan? Sunny and smiling, M. Volkov replies. The temperature has not yet dropped below 20 degrees this fall. The city inhabitants began to assemble in columns in the early morning, in order to march along the main street of Ashkhabad—named for Makhtumkuli.

I noticed a familiar face among a group of war veterans—V. Pavlenko, winner of two Orders of the Patriotic War. So the festival was a real success, Vasiliy Vasilyevich, I said.

"I expected no less," my interlocutor replied. "I have lived in Turkmenia since 1939 and it was from there that I went to the front. I am forever amazed at the affability and industry of the Turkmen people. To their credit, they have not betrayed their traditions even now, in the difficult times. There is no ethnic discord here. We continue to live happily together. Certainly, it has to be said that the Turkmen Communist Party, government, and republic's President, whom we elected by universal, direct, and secret ballot, have a big part to play."

And although in some places people are holding rallies, striking, and trying to cause confrontation, Turkmenia works on. The farmers have harvested 1.5 million tonnes of cotton this year.

The preparations for the October celebrations in Tallinn were not without problems, our special correspondent V. Shirokov writes in his report. The diverse assessments of this political date by the various Estonian parties and movements led to a division in society: Some people decided to participate in the traditional festivities, some treated 7 November as a normal working day. Well, it is a free country.

Vice Admiral Yu. Belov withstood the most negative pressure and took the firm decision to implement the USSR President's decree and hold a parade, in accordance with the time-honored tradition, on Vabaduze Square (formerly Victory Square).

Following the celebration rally, the salute, and the parade by military units, working people from Kalininskiy, Morskoy, and other rayons of the Estonian capital entered Vabaduze Square carrying red banners, slogans, and placards.

...Views of the revolution and of October may now vary. But this heroic and tragic past will always be with us, just as we will aways see the leaves turn to gold in the fall and the clear blue sky. Just as people's eternal faith in the triumph of reason, goodness, and justice will remain.

Gorbachev Receives Telegrams

LD0811163290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 8 Nov 90

[Text] On the occasion of the 73d anniversary of the Great October Revolution, telegrams are continuing to come in addressed to the country's president, the chairman of the Council of Ministers, and the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Conveyed in them are sincere congratulations and all good wishes to the Soviet people. Telegrams have come in from the leaders of Algeria, Bulgaria, Botswana, Brazil, Hungary, Spain, Kenya, Cyprus, Columbia, Cuba, Lebanon, and many other countries.

Security Foundation Protests on TV News

PM0811121790 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 6 Nov 90 First Edition p 4

["Open Letter to P.N. Reshetov, first deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting"—SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA headline]

[Text] We express our indignation and protest at a provocative report, read out by the anchorman of the "Television News Service" evening broadcast 3 November 1990, about the proceedings at a press conference of USSR international movements' representatives. This report stated that during the press conference the international movements' leaders allegedly "demanded the physical elimination of USSR President M.S. Gorbachev and RSFSR [Russian Soviet federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet Chairman B.N. Yeltsin."

Representatives of the Foundation for Ethnic and International Security who were present at the press conference with other social organizations and journalists declare in all responsibility that **the report mentioned does not correspond to the facts at all, and for that reason can be regarded as a deliberate slander and provocation.**

During the press conference the international movements' representatives read out for the mass media a Declaration on the Formation of a Central Coordinating Council of USSR International Movements containing calls for civil peace and the consolidation of society to ensure citizens' rights in the union republics. Furthermore, an Appeal to the USSR Peoples, the USSR Supreme Soviet, the United Nations, and the Progressive World Public about events in the Moldovan SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] was read out. In this appeal international movements' representatives gave a political assessment of the events of 2 November 1990, criticized the Moldovan SSR leadership and the USSR president, and formulated demands in response to the events mentioned. **The documents mentioned contained no calls for the physical elimination of any person at all.** When answering journalists' questions, the international movements' leaders repeatedly stressed the need to resolve the extreme situations that have arisen in the Moldovan SSR and other republics **by exclusively peaceful, nonviolent means.**

The whole press conference proceedings were videotaped by staffers of the USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting. The international movements' declaration and appeal were handed in printed form to mass media representatives.

We demand that a judicial investigation of this incident be held, that the culprits behind this provocation be found, and that they publicly apologize to the USSR international movements and television viewers.

[Signed] L. Shershnev, president of the Foundation for Ethnic and International Security, major general. Foundation members: K. Myalo, candidate of historical sciences; V. Ovchinskiy, candidate of juridical sciences; D. Bondyayev, Moscow State University graduate student.

'Interdvizheniye' Groups Set Up Central Council

PM0811142190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 6 Nov 90 First Edition p 4

[Report by Lieutenant Colonel S. Pashayev under "Direct Line" rubric: "Association Announced"]

[Text] Moscow—The scientific-practical conference entitled "Interdvizheniye: State of and Prospects for Its

Activity" has ended work. Representatives of Interdvizheniye [International Movement] groups from republics and regions of the country have announced the creation of a Central Coordinating Council of International Movements of the USSR (TsKS ID) and stated that they advocate equal rights for citizens, a socialist choice for the country's development path, and a federative union of equal republics.

As O. Polishchuk and Ye. Varfolomeyeva, members of the Central Coordinating Council, stated in conversation, the report which appeared in a television news program about irresponsible remarks at the conference addressed to M.S. Gorbachev and B.N. Yeltsin is not factual. The council members regarded this as disinformation and an attempt to discredit Interdvizheniye in the country.

Call for Interethnic Restructuring Issued

91UN0189B Moscow PRAVITELSTVENNYY VESTNIK in Russian No 42, Oct 90 pp 1, 8-9

[Article by V. Bagdasarov, candidate of philosophical sciences, under the "Problems of the Federation" rubric: "On the Basis of Consent"]

[Text] The process of restructuring the whole system of social relations in a multinational country such as ours could not have failed to stir interethnic contradictions. They built up over decades, but were not fully resolved.

The intensified process of disregard for the national aspect, the prevalence of the unitary over the federal principle, the hierarchical nature of national-state structures, the ranking of the peoples, the unresolved nature of the problems of small peoples and also of those which had in the past been deprived of their status and historical homeland—all these and other problems were suppressed and driven deep down for a while. Perestroyka released these contradictions from the shackles of the administrative command system, and they unfolded in all their complexity, comprehensiveness and varidirectionality, frequently developing into rigid interethnic confrontation and twisting the fate of hundreds of thousands of people. In the grip of former stereotypes concerning the resolved nature of the nationality issue in the USSR, the country's reforming leadership did not immediately appreciate the depth of the deformations and contradictions in the sphere of the nationality policy and here and there at the start of perestroyka indulged in relapses into a command, superficial attitude toward the essence of the problems.

The further development of events demands a change in our views of national relations as a constant sphere of social ties. They represent a dynamic environment of social relations presupposing both contradictions and conflicts. From this comes a new function of policy—not driving conflicts deep down and not constraining them by the external factor but affording them an opportunity to reveal themselves fully, given the need to help direct them into a constructive channel for the solution of the accumulated problems.

In a society which is abandoning stifling uniformity and which recognizes the coexistence of different interests of individuals and communities contradictions and conflicts are inevitable. It is important that they be revealed in good time and that they be afforded scope for realization without infringing the dignity and rights of the individual. The proposition put forward by social anthropologists E. Pain and A. Popov, that in the process of the self-development of such conflicts the most deep-seated contradictions of interethnic relations are revealed and that this is an absolutely essential prerequisite for the harmonization of the latter, would seem correct.

It needs to be candidly acknowledged that we have not been and are not now, unfortunately, sufficiently dialectical in our views on society.

Earlier the methods of introducing internationalism corresponded to the administrative command system and supercentralization. Internationalism was implanted from above thanks primarily to the supplanting of the national—as an ideological postulate. A basis of mass-psychological rejection of this in this form and even active resistance to it matured simultaneously. This reaction may be understood as opposition to the standardization of the peoples implanted over a long period of time and as the rapid growth of national self-awareness not claimed in good time.

However, a very painful "abscess" has now manifestly come to light in the development of the national movements toward the swelling and protuberance of purely national problems. The sovereignization of each and every thing has occupied people's natural national feelings and in some places disconnected common sense. It seems to some people that by declaring independence from all-Union structures they really become so in a single day, but this is just an illusion and a far from innocuous myth. Such actions can only rapidly break up the country's entire structure of relations, which is what we are observing currently. A cave-in of the evolved relations between the center and the republics is occurring, labor and production discipline is falling sharply, contracted supplies are being disrupted at every step, and protectionism and isolationism are growing.

But will this make things more comfortable for the individual? After all, what is more important for him is not an announcement that he is a sovereign but rather it is the creation of civilized conditions for a decent life. And we can only create such conditions in the present situation together.

What is meant at this time by the demand for the state independence of the republics? Independence from whom—from the Union? But then there could not be the Union itself. Perhaps it is independence from the outside world which is being propounded? But this is the way to national exclusiveness and regression. It is paradoxical, but some authors, while recognizing the interdependence, interrelated nature, and indivisibility of the modern world, are attempting to drag in the proposition of state independence within the Union. This is engendering serious confusion. In my view, here it should be a question merely of the competence and prerogatives of the center and the republics. It is important to determine the limits within whose framework priority is reserved to the center or a republic, and in this sense it is possible to speak about the partners' relative independence.

It is known that part of the national intelligentsia is inclined to give national values pride of place. From this emerges the postulate concerning the priority of the indigenous peoples—this infinite argument which reduces everything to the absurd. In fact, all this leads to nationalism being put in the place of socialism. Let us say plainly that nationality policy at the current stage frequently takes shape under pressure from national and, at times, avowedly nationalist movements and is constantly assuming the form of concessions. We have apprehended too straightforwardly Lenin's directive concerning the need for particular carefulness, caution, and tractability. The question turns on the initial position—to which line is it possible to give way? If national interests were not connected with the interests of other peoples, it would be possible to give way infinitely. But the interests of other peoples are encountered here, and it is only possible to give way to some at the expense of the interests of others, and consequently compromise and mutual concessions are necessary.

It should be borne in mind also that the political instability in a number of regions, the outbursts of local national-chauvinism and Russophobia, and the growing stream of refugees are stimulating a counterwave of Russian nationalism. There are signs that in response to the "Sajudist" scenario of the development of events the "Dnestr" version—the creation of Russian enclaves—is perfectly possible in certain republics. A kind of "revolution of sovereignties" which has seized the Russian autonomous regions could also ultimately lead to an escalation of interethnic conflicts and set in motion the defense mechanisms of the Russian population.

The danger of the growth of the nationalist mood and the conflicts connected with it is being further manifested in the fact that a national bureaucracy is coming increasingly emphatic to replace the Union bureaucracy, whose credit of trust has run out. The idea that the interests of the national bureaucracy (some party and state officials and part of the national intelligentsia from the ranks of the so-called indigenous peoples should be put in this category) are identical to national interests and that the latter coincide with the interests of the national-state formations is being propounded with increasing persistence.

Concepts of creating on the territory of our country several formations—a return to a single and indivisible Russia, the Russian Union, the Turkestan Republic, Baltia—have been put in ideological circulation and are being spread comprehensively. People arguing thus are either divorced from actual realities or are deliberately bent on the disintegration of such a complex historical formation as our Union. The joint residence of the peoples in a single state has a history of many centuries, and the interests of tens of millions of people are interwoven therein, and tearing it apart would mean engendering conflicts for decades to come.

Now, when national populism has reached its apogee in the declaration of sovereign oblasts, rayons, air space and so forth, it is essential that we switch from raptures over the rapid growth of national self-awareness to a sober analysis, an anticipation of the possible consequences of one step or another of the government and central and local authorities of Soviet power and the formulation of specific effective measures. It needs to be seen that attempts to solve all the problems which have mounted up over decades thanks to the creation of conditions for the preferential development of the so-called indigenous peoples, and haste and precipitation in decisionmaking, which strike at the interests and dignity of people of different nationalities, will do nothing but harm. The time has come to look for ways of interaction and mutual cooperation for the good of all peoples.

The process which is now gaining momentum—the conclusion of bilateral and multilateral agreements between Union republics—would seem fruitful in this connection. They presuppose a high degree of independence of the subjects of the USSR, but simultaneously also responsibility for the integrity of the single economic space and all-Union market. This process should presuppose a mutual consideration of the interests of the center and the republics.

Transition to the market is precisely what is so necessary for the creation of the economic foundation of the new union based on laws already enacted by the Supreme Soviet. For this reason the path toward the market is simultaneously also a path toward the creation of a union of sovereign states and the removal of many causes of interethnic conflict.

As the CPSU Central Committee October (1990) Plenum rightly observed, the force economically binding the Union under market conditions is not the administrative power of the state but the economic power of the principal subject of the market—the enterprise, as the sovereign commodity producer. The market, as the economic foundation of a qualitatively new Union, will make it possible to have done with the monopoly diktat of the central authorities and will gradually rectify the distortions of the irrational interrepublic division of labor.

However, this is one aspect. It should be borne in mind that in line with the maturation of conditions, that is, the switching on of the mechanisms of the market economy and the democratization of all aspects of social life, the effect of the second trend on the nationality issue, which is becoming predominant in the modern civilized world, will show through in ever greater relief. It presupposes the development and increased frequency of all kinds of relations between nations, a breaking down of national barriers, and the internationalization of social life.

And if now the main task of the current moment is the direction of the processes of national revival into a constructive channel, at the next stage we will have to include social mechanisms for the ethnic protection of the peoples together with this. What is meant here? There is every reason to believe that the creation of an all-Union market activated on the basis of genuinely economic relations would bind our Union more tightly than any legal provisions and statutes. The market also presupposes the possibility of accelerating the socioeconomic and national-cultural development of the peoples and the harmonization of interethnic relations.

Although society now is already prepared for acceptance of the market, in the main, at the same time the entire emotional content of our deliberations amounts, as a rule, to the social protection of the needy strata of the population. But we are forgetting that the market is a harsh and brutal thing even for more than just this category of people. Standardization, industrialization, urbanization—these are realities of the market and the market economy. A sizable dose of pragmatism and vulgar-economic practicalness, which will inevitably appear, could jeopardize the peoples' aspiration to revive national cultures and engender conflicts of a different level. We should, therefore, even now, in good time, be thinking about a system of protective measures both on the part of the center and the local authorities.

The formulation of a program for each people, particularly small peoples, will be required here. Urgent measures of an economic, legal, and ecological nature, which on the one hand contribute to the preservation of the traditional forms of economic management and on the other afford scope for the use of the achievements of modern civilization, and the creation of special conditions in the administration of territories and their resources and the results of economic activity are needed here also.

There is a mass of problems of a national dimension which until recently were not taken into consideration in political aims. Problems of linguistic, racial, and religious groups of the population, say. The class approach substituted for and to a certain extent did away with all this. But it is essential now that we formulate a differentiated approach which makes it possible to take account of the specifics of work with Europeoid [yevropeoidniy] and Mongoloid peoples, with Caucasian, Slavonic, Turkic, Germanic and Romance languages, and with the peoples confessing Christianity, Islam, Lamaism, Buddhism, and so forth.

It is essential also to bear in mind that entry into the market will for different peoples have different consequences for their national cultures. This process could lead primarily to a lowering of the living standard of the working people and a deterioration in the socioeconomic position of the republics whose starting positions are worse than others (Uzbekistan, Kirghizia, Tajikistan, Turkmenia, Kazakhstan).

It is very important here to foresee the possibility of a protectionist mood among republics and regions if there is a disregard for their national interests and specifics. Consequently, it is essential to devise some shock-absorbing mechanism. On the one hand the economic interest of the republics and regions in one another should be a permanent factor. At the same time, however, preserving territorial monopolism in the production, processing, and sale of some types of products, which would objectively foster national egotism, would be intolerable.

It is essential also to clearly and unambiguously declare that a rise in the living standard can only gain momentum if the interethnic conflicts are removed and only given the peoples' mutual tolerance. The stabilization and augmentation of the rate of socioeconomic development are impossible without the stabilization of national relations. We shall give just a few figures which clearly illustrate this proposition. The country's economy lost 10 million man-days in eight months of 1990 alone because of strikes. The direct reduction in output in connection with the stoppages and the incomplete load of enterprises in the industry of the republics of the Transcaucasus and the Tajik Soviet Socialist Republic in January-March 1990 alone is put at approximately R1.3 billion. Such is the price of intolerance and the attempts to solve one's own problems at the expense of other peoples.

The question of the timeliness of the center's reaction to interethnic conflicts is very important in the plane of practical policy. This has become a very urgent topic. Sometimes the center is accused of tardiness, sometimes of haste, but the truth is that decisions on emergency measures—whether the use of military force or steps of an administrative and legislative nature—are adopted on the basis of assessments of the situation by the local leadership. Not once has the Army yet been used, say, without the approval of the local authorities.

It should be noted that the country's political leadership, realizing the precepts of the democratization of the relations of the center and the localities, displays a high degree of trust in the local authorities, sometimes placing unwarranted reliance on the authenticity of the information coming from official representatives. Considering that in the present transitional period there is a danger of new interethnic conflicts emerging, it would be expedient to formulate a mechanism for the interaction and mutual responsibility of the local and central authorities. The enlistment of independent expert testimony upon the manifestation of signs of conflict with the formulation of a forecast and ways of eliminating the focal point would be very effective.

It ensues from what has been said that we are on the threshold of cardinal changes throughout the structure of relations between the Union and its subjects. All this must be fittingly reflected in the new Union treaty. Work on it is now being performed intensively, and we must contribute to the realization in the treaty of the harmony of national and all-Union interests, given the unconditional priority of the rights of each individual to exercise his requirements, regardless of his national affiliation.

At the same time the aspiration of some republics to apply some residual principle toward the center—to delegate to it a minimum of rights and at the same time "dump" onto it the most arduous and complex spheres of activity—is disturbing. That is, to turn the Union in fact into an amorphous confederation of sovereign states. It would seem that this question is in need of serious reflection and in-depth study. I believe that a frail center is what the subjects of the Union themselves need least of all. After all, it is a strong center which could pursue an effective policy of equalization of the economic and social development of the regions. It is a powerful center which would be able to implement major scientific and technical programs geared to the long term and develop basic science, culture, and all-state social and economic programs. The creation of Union reserve insurance funds would afford an opportunity for a large-scale maneuver in the event of an emergency in one republic or another. For this reason the effect of vertical and horizontal relationships should be clearly linked in the Union treaty. There are, finally, problems of a global nature—the environment, space, strategic defense, development of the country's most abundant minerals and foreign policy—which require cooperation and coordinated efforts.

And modern world integration processes also are exhibiting a move toward an ever greater amalgamation of the efforts of the developed states and the creation of powerful centers for joint activity. A prosperous, free, and democratic society cannot be built in isolation. Of course, our state is now in need of help from the world community and international organizations more than ever. Economic assistance would undoubtedly afford us an opportunity to intensify the process of perestroyka and ease many contradictions.

But whoever believes that the USSR has no way of regulating the conflicts and contradictions tearing it apart other than through the United Nations is profoundly deluded. No interethnic forces are capable of resolving a conflict unless there are the internal conditions for this and unless the parties agree to mutual concessions. The experience of such countries as Lebanon and Cyprus shows that the most that may be achieved with the aid of force is the shifting of the conflict for a time from active forms to sluggish development, but resolving it without the removal of the intrinsic causes is impossible. Nationalism is not removed by the commitment of troops and the imposition of sanctions, we have seen this for ourselves repeatedly in the example of the interethnic conflicts of the perestroyka period.

Each serious interethnic conflict is, if you will, individual and has its own prehistory, psychology and stages of development. But each conflict has something in common also—the intolerance by representatives of the indigenous nationality of "foreigners" and the interest of certain forces (part of the national bureaucracy and intelligentsia, corrupt elements, and the criminal world) in the realization of their own power ambitions and the achievement of social revanche.

Only on the basis of the democratization of relations between peoples and national-state formations may interethnic conflicts be averted. Only by realizing the right of each individual, regardless of national affiliation, to free development can we lay claim to a fitting place in the world community. Only through radical economic reform, a controlled market economy and a law-based civil society with a high cultural and educational standard can we approach a renewed union of sovereign states.

Lukyanov Outlines Need for 'Civil Consensus'

PM0811165590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
3 Nov 90 Union Edition p 2

[Report by correspondent G. Alimov: " 'We Are Open to Dialogue'"]

[Text] On 1 November the leader of the Union legislature, A. Lukyanov, held a meeting in the Kremlin with leaders of political parties, unions, and movements. This is the first dialogue to be held at such a high level to discuss ways in which various social forces can collaborate and play a more active role in restructuring processes and in the achievement of a consensus, civil harmony, and peace in the country.

It seems to me that this is only the beginning. But I would like to think that it is a very promising beginning. In a country torn apart by cohtradictions, conflicts, and mistrust, this kind of dialogue is as vital as the air we breathe.

I would not say that the makeup of the meeting reflected all the colors of the present political landscape. It would be more true to say that only a section—and possibly a fairly narrow section—of the forces that have announced their existence or are already active was represented at this first meeting. But this fact in no way reduces the significance of what happened in the Kremlin on 1 November.

Speaking before the meeting, A. Lukyanov said that it could not be put off any longer and had to take place. We are fated to work together—there is simply no other way, he said. I am talking about collaboration with the authorities—collaboration on an equal footing with the president and the Supreme Soviet.

Representatives of 14 different parties, groups, and movements took part in the free, relaxed conversation which lasted three and a half hours. The office of the chairman of the Soviet legislature was filled with people who hold very different ideas and beliefs and who even differ from one another in their external appearance, i.e. in their hairstyle and clothing: Some were dressed in respectable suits while others wore sweaters and jeans and had long hair down to their shoulders. You can see this for yourselves from the list of representatives: L. Alimov (Liberal Democratic Party); V. Girshfeld (Citizens' Association); V. Kuklin (Party of the Individual); Ye. Sedov (Peace Party); V. Damye (Green Party-Green Alternative); A. Akhtayev (Islamic Revival Party); A. Shubin (Confederation of Anarcho-Syndicalists); V. Skurlatov (Russian People's Front); S. Yurkov-Engelgard (Orthodox Monarchist Order-Pramos); A. Shmukhler (All-Union Council of Jewish Organizations); Yu. Yegorov (Marxist Platform in the CPSU); V. Voronin (A.D. Sakharov Union of Democratic Forces); S. Shatokhin (Save the Volga Committee); and D. Leonov, who attended the meeting as an observer from Pamyat.

The conversation, which, as was to be expected, had no set time limit, revealed differences of approach on many issues but also common concern regarding the situation in society and the danger of growing extremist trends on both right and left. It goes without saying that every party and movement has different experience, a different level of political sophistication, and a different perception of the situation in the country. Hence the differences of approach to various problems. But there was not a single participant who did not support the idea of dialogue. In my view, the value of these meetings was most accurately expressed by Anarcho-Syndicalist representative A. Shubin, who said that this dialogue must be given more organized forms. In his opinion, it is needed not for the purpose of forming some sort of "shadow cabinet" or moving it "out into the light of day" but in order to achieve understanding. He also urged that the range of participants be broadened and said that there is possibly even some point in gathering individual blocs of parties at the same table.

I waited to see what kind of response there would be to A. Lukyanov's statement on the forms that various political movements' participation in state affairs could take. The chairman very frankly said that there is an urgent need for this. There followed the proposal that it would not be a bad idea to set up some kind of consultation center along the lines of a "third chamber" of legislature. A. Lukyanov immediately put forward a proposal of his own, having agreed with the previous suggestion: What if we were to submit all draft laws for your expert appraisal—"sound them out," so to speak, in parties, unions, and associations first of all? Legislature could also invite representatives of various parties to discuss matters of interest to everyone. Let us work together—our eyes and hearts are open to this kind of dialogue, the leader of the legislature stressed. This is what is needed at the present stage, even if it takes forms which are possibly not to everyone's liking; that is how the situation has developed. You must remember that when the elections to the Congress of People's Deputies and the Supreme Soviet were being held, many parties had not yet come into existence and others operated underground as they were still considered to be "the dregs of society." In order to broaden representation in the supreme bodies of legislative power, it was decided to allow people from social organizations to stand for deputy, although this met with mixed reactions.

This situation cannot be changed rapidly now, however, A. Lukyanov said. That is why all social forces must collaborate in a general civil consensus and have a role to play in all state structures. This is particularly important now, with a multiparty system evolving in our country. Soviets at all levels must be the place for collaboration between various forces. In A. Lukyanov's opinion, we cannot allow the unification of democratic forces to take place outside the soviets, otherwise we will not be able to avoid fresh confrontation.

Time will tell, of course, how the dialogue will develop. But the participants in the meeting have agreed that they are prepared to sit down at the same table once a month to exchange opinions.

I believe it is extremely important for parties not in power to take part in discussing questions of the greatest importance to our country, because, apart from anything else, they need to gain political experience, experience of legislative initiative, and a sense of responsibility. If our society is to develop successfully and gain stability, we need strong parties capable of looking to the future as well as to the past and possessing good intellectual and cultural potential.

We look forward to more meetings and a continued dialogue.

Failure to Provide for Refugees Deplored

PM0811124790 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 8 Nov 90 p 3

[Report by L. Grafova: "The First Snow Fell Overnight"]

[Text] These are refugees [report accompanied by photograph of woman outside cooking over camping stove]. A separate "residential district" in a city under canvas. The photograph was taken 6 November. The first snow fell that night.... In the morning all three Moscow demonstrations overlooked their plight.

These 40 people were victims of pogroms, who then moved to Armenia and, still without a roof over their heads, have now come to Moscow—not to make any personal requests for themselves. Incidentally, they have been offered places in Moscow hotels, but they refused point-blank. Their picket's demands are purely political.

What are they trying to prove and to whom? Well, they took a petition to the Kremlin, but they are waiting for an answer, not leaving their tents day or night. Do people in the Kremlin not have the sense to see that a chain of blood has spread across the country as a result of the Sumgait pogroms, which have still not, effectively, been politically or legally assessed (the trial of a few young pogromists was no trial, but a farce).

You can discuss Karabakh and the guilt of Armenia, "which first started everything off," as much as you like (discussions of this kind are constantly flaring up around the picketers' posters), but how can we forget that this republic, devastated by earthquake and blockade, has taken in 260,000 refugees, who have begun willy-nilly to compete with the 500,000 homeless "earthquake victims"? The plan for the restoration of the disaster zone is only 10-percent complete. Unable to stand the nervous strain imposed by blockade-induced stoppages, construction workers from republics offering assistance are now leaving for home, taking with them equipment given to the disaster zone in the past. All Armenia today is a disaster zone, a living wound. Refugees huddle in attics, in metal pipes, take over empty jail cells.... "At least here I have my own tent," we heard on the grass outside the Rossiya Hotel.

The frosts will come soon and will do what the democratic Moscow militia cannot bring itself to do. The tent city will become deserted. So, will the pickets go away with nothing, will they have suffered here in vain in our city, on the trampled, frozen grass? A deputies' commission is carefully investigating complaints lodged by other residents of the tent city and is now coming to the sorrowful conclusion that most of them cannot be helped owing to the illegality of their demands. Yet the refugees' problem has long been clear to everyone.

Alas, the deputies' commission, having once invited these refugees to talk, has done nothing more for them. And the Red Cross, which presented the whole tent city with food coupons, has bypassed the refugees' picket.... Is that just because they were not on the registration list? Can we divide human tragedies into any lists or ethnic groups?

The deadlocked problem of refugees is already a matter of 1 million restless destinies. How many will there be tomorrow? After all, there are 60 million people in our country who do not live on their "native" territories.... Of whom 25 million are Russians, and they are already literally sitting on their trunks in various republics, ready to travel.

Is there no money to solve the refugee problem? What is the point of all our declarations regarding the priority of human values if refugees—those of our citizens who are most deprived of rights—are living on frozen ground in Moscow's most cherished spot, near Lobnoye Mesto, their fate of no particular concern to anyone? Can we really fail to realize that the refugee problem may blow up all our economic and democratic reforms if it is not resolved immediately?

New Legal Journal To Appear in 1991

PM0811144990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Nov 90 Union Edition p 3

[Report by N. Zaikin: ""VESTNIK VERKHOVNOGO SUDA SSSR"]

[Text] A new monthly journal, VESTNIK VERKHOVNOGO SUDA SSSR, will be published as of January 1991. The reader will find in it both discussion articles by well-known lawyers and material of use not only to law-enforcement organ personnel but also to everyone with an interest in the law. The journal will focus on the development of the judicial system. It is also intended to publish judicial essays, genuine documents relating to old and recent "famous cases" from the USSR Supreme Court archives, historical thrillers, and fictional works on legal topics.

Trade Weekly Aimed at 'More Exacting Tastes'

PM0811144590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Nov 90 Union Edition p 6

[Interview with B. Batarchuk, chief editor of the weekly PROLOG, by E. Gonzalyez; place and date not given; under the "First Impression" rubric: "Our Numbers Have Grown Further"—first three paragraphs are correspondent's introduction; last paragraph is correspondent's conclusion]

[Text] I can understand why the Moscow weekly is called KURANTY. I can understand why Leningrad's new newspaper is entitled NEVSKIY PROSPEKT. But I could not guess why the weekly founded by the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Federation of Independent Trade Unions is called PROLOG.

The prompt did not help either—the message from the new weekly's editorial board to the readers which said, in particular: "We want to be the Prologue to the future inevitable liberation of Labor." Fine, but only the fact that the weekly intends to do something epochal and topical at the same time is understandable.

The second issue of PROLOG confirmed this sensation. Presumably, the proposal at the recent trade union congress to burn this issue without trace and dismiss the editor, first transferring all publishing expenses to his account, was no coincidence. In order to ensure that no one ever again asked the following question on the front page: "How are we to make our trade unions into trade unions?"

[Gonzalyez] Yes, why PROLOG?

[Batarchuk] We think that the country is on the verge of positive changes. Everything that is happening today is the prologue to these changes. How can a newspaper that really reflects life be called anything else?

[Gonzalyez] Fine. But newspapers with other names also reflect life. The trade union paper TRUD, for instance.

[Batarchuk] PROLOG will be geared to more exacting tastes.

[Gonzalyez] There's RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA on the other hand.

[Batarchuk] PROLOG will be published for the real—rather than the imaginary—working man. [Batarchuk ends]

I realized that I would only make enemies at other editorial offices by further questioning. So I turned the conversation to the Federation of Independent Trade Unions.

[Batarchuk] The editorial office has differences of opinion with its founder, but common positions and sentiments.

[Gonzalyez] Do you have common funds?

[Batarchuk] No. Our founder provided our starting capital, which we regard as kind of credit.

[Gonzalyez] So, you'll repay it?

[Batarchuk] Well, who in our country repays credit? Can you tell from the first editions that PROLOG is produced by idiots? [Batarchuk ends]

That was not what I thought. But let us see what happens next when the weekly begins publishing on a regular basis in the new year.

Leaders Sign Zhigalin's Obituary

PM0811144190 Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 8 Nov 90 p 4

[Obituary of Vladimir Fedorovich Zhigalin]

[Excerpts] On 3 November 1990 Vladimir Fedorovich Zhigalin, hero of socialist labor and former USSR minister of heavy and transport machine building, passed away in his 84th year after a serious and prolonged illness. [passage omitted].

[Signed] N.I. Ryzhkov, L.A. Voronin, Yu.D. Maslyukov, P.I. Mostovoy, I.S. Belousov, M.S. Shkabardnya, K.T. Katushev, N.S. Konarev, S.V. Kolpakov, M.I. Shchadov, V.G. Kolesnikov, O.G. Anfimov, E.K. Pervyshin, V.M. Velichko, A.I. Volskiy, M.V. Barbarich, A.F. Kamenev, R.N. Arutyunov, V.F. Abramovskiy, V.A. Aleksandrov, N.N. Lazarev, V.M. Nalivayko, L.Ye. Selivanov, S.A. Afanasyev, V.K. Belyaninov, I.I. Stroganov.

Economic

Growing Economic Separatism Seen as Threat

LD0811115190 Berlin ADN International Service in German 1102 GMT 8 Nov 90

[Text] Frankfurt-Main (ADN)—Collapsing supply links and a slide back into barter trade among the individual Union republics of the USSR are, in the view of the Deutsche Bank, "serious threats to the excessively modest living standards of people in the Soviet Union". In a study now published called "The Soviet Union in Upheaval", the largest German commercial bank notes "growing economic separatism" in the republics. "The economy of the Soviet Union is however to a great extent reliant on the exchange of goods between the republics because of the deliberate specialization of individual republics in some products."

In the event of a practical disintegration of the Soviet Union the individual republics will have extremely different starting points for independent economic management. Six of them are economically strong, five moderately strong, and four economically weak. "Only a few have any chance at all—and even this of course would be after a certainly extremely difficult transitionary phase—of getting anywhere near the economic and cultural standard of Western Europe, which in the meantime will have become more integrated," the report says. According to the bank, the Baltic republics have the best prospects of establishing links with developments in Central and Western Europe after a certain period. The study, which is published as a booklet, contains detailed facts on all 15 Union republics.

New Foreign Exchange Practices Explained

PM0811131790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Nov 90 Union Edition p 1

[Report by I. Demchenko: "Rate of Exchange and the Foreign Currency Debt"]

[Text] A briefing on questions connected with changes in foreign currency policy was held 5 November in the USSR Foreign Ministry press center by leaders of the USSR State Bank Foreign Currency Financial Administration.

Foreign correspondents, who formed the overwhelming majority of the audience at the briefing, assessed the USSR Presidential Decree "On the Special Procedure for Using Foreign Currency Resources in 1991" to be anti-market and directed at cutting down Soviet exports. Under this decree, 40 percent of enterprises' earnings are subject to compulsory exchange into rubles at the recently introduced commercial rate whereby the dollar is equal to 1 ruble 80 kopeks. Remaining foreign currency income is taxable according to a previously established procedure. The resources thus received from all enterprises, apart from joint enterprises, where foreign capital is used will go into a union republic foreign currency fund under the jurisdiction of a specially created committee led by N. Ryzhkov.

Commenting on this decree, O. Mozhayskov, chief of the USSR State Bank Foreign Currency and Economic Administration, stressed several times that the given measures are not being adopted "just to make life easy" but are necessary to guarantee foreign currency resources to meet the obligations that the state has incurred on the foreign market. As a matter of fact, similar reasoning was used in the text of the decree: "In order to ensure that the USSR foreign debt is cancelled in 1991." But under Soviet legislation and in particular under the Law on Enterprises, Soviet enterprises, regardless of the form of ownership, are not liable for the state's obligations.

It is also difficult to agree with O. Mozhayskov's assessment that the special procedure for using foreign currency resources established for next year will not reflect on enterprises' financial interests, since it will be compensated by payment in rubles on a more advantageous basis than before. Oleg Vladimirovich expressed the opinion that now it is "much more important to create a situation where the Soviet Union can pay off its debts than to create a problem as regards individual enterprises' possible insolvency." This attitude evidently does not take into account the fact that, in general, foreign currency comes into the country almost exclusively through the exporting activity of enterprises, and the state's task consists in creating a most-favored status system for the given sphere. Obviously the innovations in foreign currency policy will force commercial and subsequently state structures to seek ways of transferring their foreign currency savings to foreign bank accounts.

O. Mozhayskov and his deputy A. Voytenkov also commented on the USSR Presidential Decree on introducing a commercial rate of exchange for the ruble against foreign currencies, which was issued just before the above-mentioned decree. According to the leaders of the USSR State Bank administration, the official rate of 60 kopeks for $1 is a realistic accounting indicator. It is based on a wide range of goods and on the purchasing power parity of the two currencies. This sounds dubious to say the least, and I would like to see just one bank in the world apart from the USSR State Bank which would agree to exchange the ruble at such a "realistic" rate.

At the same time, with the introduction of a commercial rate, all the differentiated currency rates—there are several thousand of them—which were used in calculations in export-import operations have been repealed by a USSR Council of Ministers decision. In principle the official rate will no longer be used in commercial transactions, with the exception of a number of transactions where this has been stipulated in previously concluded agreements. Under the legislation a tax will be levied on citizens' foreign currency income. This will play a mainly methodological role.

As of 1 November stores that trade in foreign currency tripled their prices in rubles. In this way, the cost of the goods in foreign currency has stayed the same, but the foreign currency ruble has fallen to one-third of its value. Similar changes are affecting all types of services that are rendered for foreign currency in our country. As A. Voytenkov reported, the USSR Bank for Foreign Economic Activity has informed all large foreign credit centers of the introduction of a commercial rate of exchange for the ruble in our country and the changes this entails. As for Soviet citizens who have foreign currency accounts in the Bank for Foreign Economic Activity, the balance of the resources in their accounts will automatically be tripled, so they will not make a loss.

Answering a question from FORTUNE magazine about the expediency of trading for foreign currency within the country, O. Mozhayskov stressed that his opinion coincides totally with the position expressed in the "500 days" program. The introduction of wide-scale trading of goods for foreign currency on the country's territory, which was stipulated by the recent union government decision, does not promote the stabilization of the ruble but does the opposite—it undermines it, and could have serious consequences for our currency.

France's Stoleru Views Move to Market Economy

PM0811164790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Nov 90 Union Edition p 5

[Paris interview with L. Stoleru, French secretary of state for planning, by IZVESTIYA own correspondent Yu. Kovalenko; place and date not given: "Lionel Stoleru: France Will Help Soviet Reform Gain a Second Wind"—first three paragraphs are editorial introduction]

[Text] An international meeting of the leaders of the Soviet, Hungarian, Polish, Romanian, Czechoslovak, and Bulgarian economic departments will be held in Paris 8 November, and is to be opened by French Prime Minister Michel Rocard. L. Abalkin, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers, is to represent our country at this meeting, which has been organized on the initiative of Lionel Stoleru, French secretary of state for planning. Our leading economists who are directly involved in elaborating the programs for the transition to the market are also expected to take part.

Jacques Delors, EEC president; Jean-Michel Camdessus, director of the IMF; Barber Conable, president of the World Bank; Jean-Claude Paye, OECD secretary general; FRG Economy Minister Helmut Haussmann; and Jacques Attali, chairman of the European Reconstruction and Development Bank, will also come to the French capital. What is more, 200 leaders of leading French enterprises have been invited to the meeting.

The unprecedented Paris forum, which will take place in camera, is to examine ways of switching from an administrative economy to a market economy. In the runup to the conference L. Stoleru received our correspondent and had a conversation with him.

[Stoleru] It may seem paradoxical at first glance that it is the French Secretariat of State for Planning, that is helping East European states abandon planning in their economy. But we are not engaged in mandatory or indicative planning, but in a strategic analysis of our market economy. I want to stress that the "moment of truth" has now come for the Soviet Union and other East European countries when they have to resolve economic problems as a matter of urgency. The Berlin Wall can be destroyed in half an hour but you cannot restore an economy with any bulldozer. France was the first to offer these state concrete means and a structural program for the transition to the market.

[Kovalenko] What specifically is the nature of your assistance and what are its results?

[Stoleru] Above all it resides in providing expert consultations on a regular basis. We are also assisting in what I would call the "first reading" of virtually all economic draft laws before they are submitted to the Soviet and other parliaments. Thus, we are to some extent doing the job of the relevant parliamentary commission and sometimes make some amendments to these documents. Lastly, we have warned East European countries of the danger of indexing and our warning was heeded. At first many people in your countries reckoned that the population's purchasing power should be protected when implementing economic reforms, by linking wages to prices rises. With incontrovertible arguments, we proved that this is a suicidal choice. We explained that France spent 30 years getting rid of indexing. Price hikes caused by the transition to the market are not, effectively, inflationary but reflect the new pricing system.

This does, of course, involve a tremendous amount of work. The French Government has created special organs, including an interministerial commission which coordinates all departments' actions in order to carry it out. In addition there is a pool comprising roughly 100 experts tackling various problems. We use them to form "teams" which we send on various missions to the USSR and other countries. We have agreed with our partners that, where necessary, any group can fly to a country immediately. Thus, former minister N. Questiaux (with the help of 20 specialists) tackles social questions, while Mr. Jenny, general reader at the Council on Questions of Competition, in conjunction with French Finance Ministry personnel, tackles price problems, and the Treasury management tackles questions of the state sector and destatization, and so on. We have a budget of 200 million francs in order to provide expert aid of this kind.

[Kovalenko] What do you see as your main difficulties?

[Stoleru] Price reform since it radically changes Soviet people's lives. Tremendous explanatory work and clear understanding of what the population will gain from the transition to the market will be needed for this. As for the five East European countries—Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Romania, and Bulgaria—they must be persuaded to act together. In the past they were united within the CEMA framework, they no longer want to help one another now that they are freed from these ties. In the last resort they prefer to deal with the USSR, their former "overseer." This reaction is quite understandable but it is irrational and counterproductive. It is impossible to switch to the market in one country alone, particularly if it is a very small country. The existence of the market in Bulgaria alone or in Lithuania or Latvia, say, would be madness. On the other hand, the Bulgarian economy can operate effectively within the framework of the European market. But we must pass through a regional market to achieve this.

[Kovalenko] In your view, are the leaders of the USSR and other East European countries ready at this stage to conduct the requisite reforms?

[Stoleru] Intellectually and conceptually they are 100-percent ready.

[Kovalenko] What about the population?

[Stoleru] I do not think that it is ready. In Poland, for instance, a year after the beginning of "shock therapy," people are saying: "We used to have money and nothing to buy. Now we have things to buy but no money." A market economy will not catch on as a global system until this feeling is overcome. Despite the fact that Poland is a country where some of the population still remember the pre-1945 market. Whereas Soviet people are only familiar with the post-1917 administrative system.

When I am in East European countries, speaking on television, I often repeat Churchill's words that "blood, sweat, and tears are needed" to attain the goal. People in these countries need to realize the importance of the transition to the market, which may take five years or more. The FRG took four years—1948 through 1952—to switch from a centralized economy to a market and from poverty to prosperity. And the new industrial countries of Asia began this transition from an incomparably lower level. I am sure that any country in the North or South can accomplish this revolution—it is important to stop preventing people from displaying initiative. East Europe will be able to successfully switch to the market and we must help it in this. The game is worth the candle—it is a question of a significant increase in the standard of living.

[Kovalenko] Have we already made mistakes on this path?

[Stoleru] You do not seem to have made mistakes yet, if you do not count the fact that you have lost so much time. However, there is a danger that the republics will begin this transition each by themselves. For instance, in Georgia I was recently told of a project to create their own currency. We in Western Europe are having some difficulty in trying to substitute a single currency for 12 national currencies. On the other hand, it would be a mistake if each of your 15 republics wants to create its own monetary unit. That is why you must avoid a movement's beginning in the union which would swim against the tide of historical development.

[Kovalenko] What is the main condition for attaining success?

[Stoleru] Persistence. I think that M.S. Gorbachev has this quality in full measure. If he effects the transition to the market as consistently as he strove to withdraw Soviet troops from Afghanistan and endeavored to achieve disarmament, I do not doubt for one minute that he will be successful.

[Kovalenko] What do you expect from the coming meeting?

[Stoleru] We will try to ensure that the transition to the market in the USSR and in other countries gains a second wind. Over the last year the requisite political conditions have been created for this: Democratic reforms, elections, and so on have been implemented. M.S. Gorbachev, having been elected president, has obtained extensive powers. Thus, in my view, every precondition now exists for the transition to the market. Concrete decisions are what is needed now.

[Kovalenko] You invited the powerful men of this world to the conference—the presidents of the IMF, the World Bank, and other highly important financial and economic institutions....

[Stoleru] They may provide you with invaluable assistance since they have the "munitions" to successfullly carry out the operation—they hold the purse strings. In other words today it is a question of pooling all efforts to assist the USSR and other East European states in the transition to the market.

*Kolkhoz Market Fresh Food Price Data

914D0032A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
1 Nov 90 Union Edition p 2

[Article by S. Mostovshchikov: "Thoughts About Food: Arising after a Conversation in the USSR Central Union of Consumer Societies"]

[Text] **There are 6,147 free economic zones operating in the USSR today. These are kolkhoz [collective farm] markets, in which the kolkhozes do virtually no trading, but the operation to sell agricultural products is carried out by private individuals. Soviet marketplaces are clearly reacting to the situation in the country's economy. According to the calculations of specialists, market prices have constantly risen in the last few years, and in 1990 there was a sharp leap and in the USSR they rose on the average by a minimum of 100 percent.**

In the Tsentrosoyuz [USSR Central Union of Consumers' Cooperatives], in which all the kolkhoz markets have been included since 1987, this situation is in conformance with principle. In the words of Grigoriy Mesropov, chief of Glavkooptorg, responding directly on behalf of the country's markets, it is the poverty of the trade conditions created for the participants which is mainly to blame. Some 70 percent of the markets are directly to be pulled down, only 40 percent have a water supply system, 58 percent—electricity, 30 percent—warehouses and storage chambers, and 20 percent—hotels. If you add to this the problems with transport and gasoline, it seems clear why the participants are not bursting to trade in the city, and the few of them who manage to do it can easily charge high prices.

Poverty, however, is something to which we are accustomed. In any case, according to the data from Mesropov, in 1987, Tsentrosoyuz took on the markets in an even worse state than today, and even managed to invest in their development about 600 million rubles—five-fold more than the authorities had spent before. Moreover, in the view of specialists, the amount of goods being placed on the kolkhoz market, while it did not diminish, was quite insignificant. The present price situation, therefore, leads one to think that certain changes have taken place in the market situation, and moreover, not happy changes.

From the data obtained at Tsentrosoyuz, we have compiled a table of the average prices for individual products in certain cities in the country (prices in rubles per kilogram):

	Beef	Pork	Cucumbers	Apples	Onions
Moscow	18-20	18-30	6-10	3-5	2-3
Leningrad	20-30	15-20	6-10	5-7	1.5-2
Minsk	9	9	5	1-3	1.7
Tashkent	8	4	1.5	1.5	0.6
Alma-Ata	6	5	1.2	0.8	0.6
Frunze	7	5	1.0	0.7-1.0	0.6
Ashkhabad	8	6	4.0	2.00	0.7

To the obvious facts of the expensive prices on the Moscow and Leningrad markets (until recently among the least expensive) it must be added that record prices have also been established here for eggs (an average of 10 rubles [R] a dozen), for vegetable oil (R10-15 per liter), pickled cucumbers (up to R10 per kilogram), potatoes (R2-3 per kilogram), and for dairy products the planned prices have risen sharply.

Very different opinions are being expressed as to the reasons for the situation that has formed. In some estimates, it is the deliberate commodity blockade that has formed in Moscow and Leningrad. Many regions in the republic are ceasing or abruptly limiting the supply to both capitals—former and present-day. (A vivid example: to transport a small shipment to Moscow, long-distance train conductors are now taking at least R10 since officially goods must not be transported from many regions of the country.)

In other estimates, it is the large cities of the USSR that are themselves to blame. Life in them has become more expensive, the general level of prices has soared appropriately, particularly in commercial stores, and private sellers of the products do not want to lag behind.

One must think that those and other conclusions have a right to exist. The conclusions of some Soviet economists, who, as far back as a year ago, expressed the opinion that in 1990 Soviet trade would cease to exist, seem to me more realistic. More precisely—the entity of a system of total distribution has its own truth. Moscow and Leningrad, which are in a privileged position, and others like them later, have felt the charm of past changes. Well, the market has not been long in breaking them.

"There can now be no question of any real competition of an individual on the market," states Grigoriy Mesropov.

Alas, it must be stated: the State, with the largest number of combines in the world, with areas adequate for fertile crops, has a hard time withstanding the participants with tiny personal plots and tool shops—that is for extra pay. The market prices are precisely their prices.

True, to be fair, it must be said that the government is doing its utmost to affect these prices. According to expert opinion, they can, in the near future, increase even more, particularly because they are anticipating a national struggle with speculation.

We have already managed to break loose from the markets the commodity-purchaser cooperatives—the professional merchants, making wholesale purchases of goods from the producers. A new battle with the outbidders—the people who are engaged in the resale of property and stiffening responsibility for these operations, can cause yet another spontaneous leap in prices for food products.

The only speculator who is now officially permitted to act at kolkhoz markets is Tsentrosoyuz, a formally implemented organization, fulfilling the orders of the government itself. The Glavkooptorg of Tsentrosoyuz, in particular, is buying up products from the population and trading them at damped-down prices. The "cooperators," however, already acknowledge that the quality of their goods is in no way inferior to that of the market, since they are buying it up under unprofitable conditions. True, while they have a shortage of clothing and equipment, mainly imported, the benefits for their acquisition are granted to the private trader, who has become a client of consumers' cooperatives. The equipment and clothing, however, have also appeared in commercial stores.... Moreover, the republic itself now intends to go out on the foreign market, and the Tsentrosoyuz may have lost its last trump card.

What then, awaits us in the near future? Grigoriy Mesropov is not attempting to predict the situation on the markets, since now no one can in general tell seriously what lies ahead in this country. The only thing that one does not have to worry about are the potatoes. Tsentrosoyuz, for example, has bought 15,000 tons of potatoes for Moscow.... Grigoriy Rachkiovich says that the "cooperatives" will have enough to trade until March. Then we will see.

We will see, of course. In general, we would like to nibble on this.

Agriculture

Agricultural Developments Reported for 4-8 Nov

LD0911021890

[Editorial Report] The following is a compilation of reports on agricultural developments in the USSR carried by Moscow Domestic Service in Russian from 4 to 8 November. Times of broadcast, given in GMT, are in parentheses at the end of each item.

4 November

No significant developments reported.

5 November

Practically the whole beet plantation harvest has been delivered to Altay's acceptance points. Sugar refineries have refined almost 700,000 tonnes of raw materials. That is more than last year. Tens of thousands of tonnes of beets have arrived from Voronezh and Omsk oblasts. The four sugar refineries in Altay are working around the clock. Collective and state farms which have overfulfiled the state plan for beet sales will receive part of the product which is in short supply. (1200)

6 November

Tajikistan's cotton farmers have delivered 800,000 tonnes of cotton to procurement points. They have another 60,000 tonnes to go to fulfill the state order. Many farms are delivering above-plan cotton. (1200)

7-8 November

No significant developments reported.

Scientific

Chernobyl Station Safety Precautions Examined

PM0811144690 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1315 GMT 5 Nov 90

[From the "Scientific Herald" program]

[Text] [Commentator] Chernobyl AES [nuclear electric power station] staffers and inhabitants of Slavutich city undergo regular medical and radiological checks at the station.

During the first 10 months of this year staffers absorbed less than two rems on average, against the normal permissible rate for professionals of five rems per year.

Those who have absorbed more than three rems are exceptional cases and subject to special monitoring.

The station is conducting its own research. People must be able to feel that their health and safety are a prime concern at the station. Therefore funds are not spared when it comes to medicine, sport, and the creation of good living conditions.

The station administration invites scientists from medical scientific research establishments from all over the country. At a conference recommendations for ways to protect the health of the Chernobyl AES staff were put forward. Military medics, for instance, suggested that more vitamins be included in the diet. A whole range of problems is being considered.

[Correspondent] Scientists from all over the country were invited to this conference. Protection of the population and radiation safety were discussed. Why convene this conference, since there is talk about shutting down the station?

[M.P. Umanets, director Chernobyl AES] People who believe that closing down the station boils down to putting a padlock on the gates are deeply mistaken. In order to shut down a station like the Chernobyl AES, great material expenditure and colossal human resources are needed. Operators will be working here for another 10 years if we start shutting down the station in 1993-1995 as envisaged in the preliminary plans. Naturally, during all this time we must take care of people because quite apart from purely professional factors they will also be subject to factors of disruption of their personal life, uncertainty about their future.... This is why I considered it necessary to set aside two days to take part in the work of this conference.

[Commentator] The station lives on, and continues to produce electricity. It is manned by professionals in the best sense of this word. They know about the atom and what must be done to keep it in check. Foreign specialists rate the qualifications of these operators as very high.

Radiation monitoring of the No. 4 unit shows that the situation is completely under control.

What is currently being done to enhance safety at the station?

[Correspondent] How effective are the measures proposed by scientists?

[M.P. Karrafk, Chernobyl AES assistant chief engineer for scientific questions] Measures to enhance the operational safety of the station have been taken. They include a modification of the reactor safety control system and the introduction of a high-speed accident prevention system. Whereas in the past it took 20 seconds for reactor safety procedures to come into play, the reactor is now shut down within 2.5 seconds.

[Correspondent] Can you guarantee the complete safety of your station?

[Karrafk] But of course, of course.

[Commentator] What future is in store for this station? What are the prospects of nuclear power generation in general? We will return to this theme in future programs.

USSR Seeks Mexican Satellite Contract

PM0811100290 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Nov 90 Union Edition p 4

[Dispatch by correspondent A. Cherepanov: "Will Our 'Proton' Win?"]

[Text] Mexico City—Our country has a unique chance to enter the international commercial market of space goods and services. If this happens, it will be in Mexico. The Soviet Union together with other countries will participate in a competition to launch the third Mexican communications satellite as part of the "Solidarity" program. The Main Administration for the Creation and Utilization of Space Technology is putting forward the delivery vehicle "Proton."

The working life of two Mexican communications satellites which have been in geostationary orbit for many years, is running out. The Mexican Government has decided to announce an international competition to design a satellite and launch it using a foreign delivery vehicle.

The Soviet side is only participating in the second part of the competition. Back in July of this year, a delegation from the Lavochkin Science and Production Association visited Mexico in order to present the "Proton" delivery vehicle. It was headed by V. Serebrennikov, acting general designer, and V. Asyushkin, chief designer. From their viewpoint the presentation went off successfully. And straight away in August, the Mexican specialists made a return visit to the USSR.

Does "Proton" have a chance of winning the Mexican competition? After all, it has fearsome rivals in France, the United States, and China. It does have a chance, and a good one, according to both Soviet and foreign specialists. At present, our delivery vehicle has no equal in the world as regards its technical characteristics. If you look at Western assessments, it also overtakes its foreign counterparts in reliability. Only "Proton" has had over 100 launches, almost all of which were successful.

"Proton" is the only vehicle of its type that is able to take satellites directly to geostationary orbit. This means that the satellite does not need its own engine, whose fuel accounts for up to a third of the weight (600-700 kg) of the complex that is put into orbit. It is not difficult to see that if "Proton" wins, the Mexicans will also automatically be able to increase the payload of their satellite and prolong its time of activity in orbit by several years. But...

There is a circumstance that casts doubt on the probability of the Soviet delivery vehicle's victory in the competition. I have in mind the U.S.-NATO embargo on importing to the USSR many types of electronics and equipment "of strategic importance"—after all, the satellite will have to be launched on Soviet territory, at Baykonur. The Soviet side has long been giving guarantees of the safe transportation of satellites on the country's territory and the presence of representatives of a Western firm at all stages—from the transportation to the actual installation and launching.

Specialists from the Lavochkin Science and Production Association believe that the Mexican competition is essentially the only chance for us to put our space goods into the international arena. It is predicted that soon the developing countries will not be placing such orders.

Military

Defense Personnel Attend Ceremonial Meeting

PM0811135590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 6 Nov 90 Second Edition p 1

["Our Correspondent" Report: "Ceremonial Meeting"]

[Text] A ceremonial meeting of personnel of USSR Defense Ministry main and central directorates marking the 73d anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution was held in the Soviet Army Central Academic Theater 5 November. The audience included generals, admirals, officers, warrant officers, soldiers, sergeants, workers, and employees of the Soviet Army and members of their families.

The meeting was opened by Army General K. Kochetov, USSR first deputy defense minister. A report was delivered by Colonel General N. Shlyaga, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate. Taking part in the meeting were O. Shenin, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and O. Baklanov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

Test Pilot G. F. Butenko Dies Suddenly

PM0811130990 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 6 Nov 90 First Edition p 4

[G.F. Butenko Obituary]

[Excerpts] Major General of Aviation Gennadiy Filippovich Butenko, meritorious test pilot of the USSR and candidate of technical sciences, has died suddenly. He devoted his entire conscious life to the selfless service of the motherland and the cause of the Communist Party, which he joined in 1952.

G.F. Butenko was born 22 May 1928 in Usolye, a town in Perm Oblast. [passage omitted]

In 1959 G.F. Butenko graduated from the Professor N.Ye. Zhukovskiy Air Force Engineering Academy and engaged in scientific and flight-testing work at various posts. He flew 3,518 hours, mastered 65 types and modifications of airplanes and helicopters, and authored a number of articles and textbooks. [passage omitted]

[Signed] Ye.I. Shaposhnikov, G.M. Benov, P.S. Deynekin, A.I. Malyukov, A.F. Borsuk, A.S. Goryainov, S.I. Ivanov, V.M. Shishkin, A.I. Ayupov, V.Ya. Kremlev, L.V. Kozlov, V.A. Levchuk, A.A. Shapetko, A.N. Obelov, A.S. Stefashin, A.G. Yemanov, V.A. Zykov, and Yu.P. Klishin.

Baltic Republics

Lithuania Protests 7 November Military Parade

LD0811201790 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1538 GMT 8 Nov 90

[Statement adopted by Lithuanian Supreme Council, read by Deputy Cepaitis at the afternoon session of the Lithuanian Supreme Council in Vilnius—live]

[Text] On 7 November this year, disregarding protests by the Supreme Council and the Government of the Republic of Lithuania, units of the USSR occupation army stationed in Lithuania staged a military parade. The demonstration of military power was accompanied by acts of violence directed against citizens of the Republic of Lithuania.

During attempts by paratroopers to occupy the building of the Lithuanian Conservatoire, where lectures were taking place at that time, severe injuries were inflicted on Lithuanian citizens and the property of the educational institution was destroyed. Clashes among people were also provoked in other parts of the capital causing material damage.

Thanks only to the self-control and discipline of people, the occupation army was unsuccessful in provoking serious incidents.

These actions by the USSR Army demonstrate once again that the USSR leadership, having signed in Helsinki the concluding act on security and cooperation in Europe consistently declaring the creation of legal values, disregards the sovereignty of the states, law, and humanity.

Such USSR actions discredit it as a partner in the negotiations with the Republic of Lithuania in the eyes of the world community, especially on the eve of the Paris meeting.

Not only the demonstration of power, but also its use in Lithuania should once again remind the world public and the government of the states that the USSR Armed Forces continue to brutally violate the elementary rights of people, citizens, and nations.

The Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania, protesting such actions by the USSR Army, appeals to the states-participants in the Paris meeting, asking them to condemn these actions.

Burokevicius Discusses Parade

LD0811131990 Moscow World Service in Russian 1030 GMT 8 Nov 90

[Excerpt] According to a report by the INTERFAX correspondent, central Vilnius was closed for traffic for several hours on 7 November. A military parade took place in Gediminas Prospect, the central thoroughfare of the Lithuanian capital. Certain individuals tried to block the advance of military hardware, but the servicemen who were cordoning the area off thwarted these attempts and ensured the continuation of the parade. [passage omitted]

Interviewed by the INTERFAX correspondent, Mikolas Burokevicius, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Communist Party of Lithuania/CPSU/ Central Committee, noted that compared to the May celebrations in Vilnius, many more people gathered despite the fact that the republic's current authorities had declared 7 November a working day. He interpreted this fact as evidence of a psychological change among people in Lithuania in favor of a sane and realistic view of the situation and as evidence of surviving traditions of the October holiday. It is estimated that about 100,000 people took part in the festive march in Vilnius.

Landsbergis Appeals for CSCE Membership

LD0811210490 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1556 GMT 8 Nov 90

[Speech by Lithuanian Supreme Council Chairman Vytautas Landsbergis at the afternoon session of the Lithuanian Supreme Council, in Vilnius—live]

[Excerpts] Esteemed deputies: You have in front of you a draft appeal I wrote after consulting the chairman of the Estonian Supreme Council where similar documents are being drafted. We agreed to meet tomorrow on the level of the Baltic Council and appeal with a similar document on behalf of the Baltic Council, but it was our common view that statements by the Supreme Councils would strengthen the position of the Baltic Council.

We have appealed more than once to CSCE participants on the participation of the Baltic states in the forums of the Helsinki process and in the Paris conference, noting our rights and quest to become full members of that conference, or in the beginning at least to obtain the status of an observer.

This appeal is of a different nature since it concerns the content of that conference. We can participate without sitting there; we can participate by responding to the matters under discussion there. One of them is the process of reducing arms in Europe. [passage omitted]

We support reducing armed forces. This is the line and will of our states. We think the European states could, in one way or another, not forget and repeat their nonrecognition of the annexation of the Baltic states, as it was made recently by the U.S. Senate ratifying the German unification treaty. [passage omitted]

On the wish of the Baltic states, the Senate passed the known resolution stating that everything stated there does not change the U.S. attitude toward the nonrecognition of the annexation of the Baltic states. [passage omitted]

We have a convenient opportunity to remind not only in the preamble but also in the second paragraph that in estimating the dislocation of the Soviet Army in the Soviet Union itself and beyond its borders, how many troops, and the length of time they will be stationed beyond the borders of the Soviet Union, Lithuania should belong to the second category—that is Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia—in the category beyond the borders. [passage omitted]

We ask all states that, in the agreements, expressions suggesting that the Baltic states are part of the Soviet Union are not smuggled in.

This draft could be improved, but one wishes to send it as soon as possible so that tomorrow some states could state their stand on the participation of the Baltic states in the Paris conference. [passage omitted]

Lithuania Supreme Council Adopts Resolutions

On Military Service

LD0811203390 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1550 GMT 8 Nov 90

[Resolution adopted by the Lithuanian Supreme Council; read by Deputy Slicyte at the afternoon session of the Lithuanian Supreme Council in Vilnius—live]

[Text] The Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania, guided by its resolutions on 12 March and 9 April on the invalidity of the USSR law on general military service of 12 October 1967 on the territory of the Republic of Lithuania and on the call up of Lithuania's citizens to the USSR Armed Forces, resolves:

1. The residents of the Republic of Lithuania who decide to serve in the USSR Armed Forces must inform the territorial unit of the country's defense department;

2. The Lithuanian state does not guarantee compensation to those who (?become dishonored) during the service in the USSR Armed Forces;

3. Those who voluntarily serve in the USSR Armed Forces are not entitled to privileges and guarantees contained in the labor law;

4. This resolution does not apply to those compelled by force to serve in the Soviet Union's Armed Forces;

5. This resolution goes into effect on the day of its adoption.

On Border Service

LD0811232190 Vilnius International Service in English 2230 GMT 8 Nov 90

[Text] After lengthy debate today, the Lithuanian parliament adopted a provisional law on frontier service.

The law states that the frontier service is a separate unit of the country's defense department, responsible for the protection of the borders of the Republic of Lithuania and for the regime of the frontier zone. It also assists the customs service of the Republic in carrying out its functions.

The newly set up service will get part of the money raised from confiscated goods to improve its material and technical base. The Lithuanian frontier service will work at the initial stage alongside Soviet frontier guards, who are now in control of the Lithuanian state border.

The enlistment of volunteers for the new service has already begun.

Lithuanian Plan for Separate Budget 'Serious'

PM0811163190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Nov 90 First Edition p 1

[Roundup of PRAVDA-TASS reports prepared by G. Batsanova under the rubric "Telephone, Teletype, Telefax": "Vilnius"]

[Text] According to a report by A. Rudis, chairman of the Lithuanian legislature's budget commission, as of the new year the republic's budget is to be separated from the Soviet Union budget. It is hard to say what consequences this step may have. On the one hand, A. Rudis advised those who hold various loan bonds to cash them in before 15 December. This suggests that the plans to separate the budget are serious and that the republic will then have to rely exclusively on its own capability. On the other hand, the chairman of the budget commission promised to abolish the childlessness tax in the near future.

Lithuanians Told They Need Not Answer Draft

PM0811154190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Nov 90 Union Edition p 2

[Dispatch by Nikolay Lashkevich under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Lithuanian Parliament Statement"]

[Text] Vilnius—The citizens of Lithuania are not obliged or recommended to serve in the USSR Armed Forces—this is the essence of a special Lithuanian Supreme Soviet statement.

It affirms that "the old mechanisms of compulsory military service are being unlawfully implemented in Lithuania" and this means that young men of draft age do not have to serve in the "army of a foreign state." At the same time it is specified that the republic does not prohibit young men from serving of their own free will.

"The Armed Forces of the Soviet Union do not have the right to exert pressure of any kind on those who do not respond to the draft in Lithuania," the statement says. This is a direct allusion to the activity of military commissariats in Lithuania.

To be frank, today's draftees and their parents are not to be envied. On the one hand they have to fulfill the instructions of the republic's supreme power, and on the other the Union legislation.

"The way of compromise is to be found in talks," A. Visotskis, the republic military commissar believes.

Meanwhile the Lithuanian Legislature statement does not say anything about talks as the most likely way of resolving problems connected with the draft into the Army. Furthermore, it is affirmed that soon "Lithuanian men will be drafted to serve in their motherland." This mood for creating separate military structures was also confirmed by the latest discussion in the republic Supreme Soviet of the draft law on the territory's security. In particular, the draft law determines the rights and duties of a Lithuanian serviceman, the place where he performs military service, the oath is set out, and military ranks are stipulated. Thus there will be three types of generals in the future Lithuanian Army according to the draft law: brigade, division, and ordinary generals. By all accounts, the previously popular idea of turning Lithuania into a demilitarized zone will become unrealistic.

Lithuania Aide Views Economic Ties With USSR

PM0811155790 Copenhagen BERLINGSKE TIDENDE in Danish 5 Nov 90 (ERHVERV section) p 4

[Report on interview with Lithuanian Foreign Trade Ministry Deputy Director Edmundas Kackus by Lise Tajik in Copenhagen; date not given : "Baltic Region Cannot Break Economically With Soviet Union"]

[Text] "Economic ties with Moscow are so strong that it will be impossible to break with the government in Moscow," said Edmundas Kackus, deputy director of Lithuania's Foreign Trade Ministry.

"We are deeply integrated, nor is there any reason to break off economic ties. But we will seek to establish a new economic order between the three Baltic republics—without breaking with Moscow since we have a joint interest in maintaining economic ties," said Kackus who has just ended a visit to the Danish Chamber of Trade in Copenhagen.

He admitted that it is easier for Lithuania to achieve political freedom than to achieve economic independence from the Soviet Union. He also admitted that it will take many years to reshape the system and adapt it to the new thinking on the market economy.

[Tajik] What did Lithuania learn from the Soviet oil embargo during this spring's struggle for independence, and what do you think the Soviet Union learned?

[Kackus] It confirmed that our desire for independence is very strong, but at the same time we learned how deeply we are tied to the Soviet Union. I think the Soviet Union has understood our desire for independence, but has also realized that it needs our goods.

Estonia Forms Goods Export Quotas for Citizens

LD0811192190 Moscow TASS in English 1900 GMT 9 Nov 90

[Report by ETA-TASS correspondents Ruta Pels and Jaak Talva]

[Text] Tallinn November 8 TASS—Private individuals will henceforth be allowed to take out of Estonia a total of no more than 200 roubles worth of goods, including no more than 50 roubles worth of food, one litre of hard liquer and ten packets of cigarettes, unless they have a special permit for more, according to a government ordinance that has already become effective.

Its practical effectiveness will depend on the preparedness of economic border guards and customs officers, said Deputy Director-General of the Estonian Trade and Licencing Department Aleksandr Skoblov.

Estonian Front Supports 'Centrist Policy'

LD0811173190 Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian 1500 GMT 8 Nov 90

[Excerpts] The board of the Estonian People's Front issued a statement regarding the political scandal in Estonia.

The political crisis destabilizes the situation in the state and makes it more difficult for the issue of the Baltics and Estonia to be discussed at the Paris conference. [passage omitted]

In the present complex situation in both domestic and foreign policy, the Estonian People's Front will pledge firm support to the moderate centrist policy, with Edgar Savisaar's government also being one to implement this. The Estonian People's Front sees the implementation of the present government's program as the most realistic way toward restoring Estonia's own statehood. The full text of the People's Front statement will be published in newspapers.

Riga Water Supply 'Poisoned', Pressure Drops

LD0811184190 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 1000 GMT 8 Nov 90

[Text] The Riga Water and Sewerage Board says it is necessary to cut the water supply to the city from Daugava reservoir due to the leakage of harmful substances from the Novopolotsk polymer works.

Therefore, water pressure throughout the city has been reduced, particularly in Pardaugava, downtown Riga, Jaunmilgravis, Vecmilgravis, and (Kengarags). Water there can only reach the ground floor.

Specialists at the sanitary epidemiological station explained that the filtering of poisoned water into the city's water supply will not be allowed.

Water reaching residences in the rayons mentioned is being taken from underground water reservoirs and artesian boreholes. Even so, it is recommended that water be boiled before it is drunk.

RSFSR

Silayev Says Russia To Strengthen Sovereignty

LD0811204390 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 2000 GMT 8 Nov 90

[Text] The Supreme Soviet and government of the Russian Federation intend to pursue a firm course of strengthening its sovereignty.

The statement was made by the Russian prime minister, Ivan Silayev. He stressed that the Russian authorities do not visualize the republic outside the Soviet Union but wish to see it fundamentally renewed.

Speaking of the transition to a market economy, Silayev said that Russia will carry out its own updated program. The economy is being reformed in conditions of galloping inflation, he said. That is why the Russian Government is planning special steps to cushion the inflation blow and protect the interests of people in the low income bracket, Silayev said.

Kozyrev Discusses Foreign Policy Objectives

Move to 'Democratisation' Seen

LD0711224490 Moscow TASS in English 2101 GMT 7 Nov 90

[Text] United Nations November 7 TASS—It is necessary to move ahead towards democratisation, openness and new thinking in international affairs, Russia's Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev told a news conference at the U.N. headquarters today.

Kozyrev is a member of the Soviet delegation at the 45th U.N. General Assembly.

"Foreign policy of the Russian Federation will be determined by the republican parliament, and today I am not ready to speak of it in detail. I believe the best elements of new political thinking and democratic trends, in connection with which President Mikhail Gorbachev was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize, will undoubtedly be its main direction," he said.

"I believe that the awarding of the Nobel Prize to President Gorbachev notes the need to move ahead towards democratisation, openness and new thinking," he said.

Speaking of the role of the Russian Federation in international affairs, Kozyrev said: "Russia needs a common sense policy. We will try to overcome globalistic and imperial plans, ideological motives and determine normal interests of Russia and its people."

"This will somewhat reduce our involvement in a number of regions, first of all, remote areas in the military aspect. We will try to determine a reasonable sufficiency in military issues, unlike a global superpower. At the same time, Russia with its 150 million population, will anyway play the role of a great power in Europe and Asia," he said.

"As for the 45th U.N. General Assembly session, Russia will try to win support for its plan of cooperation in cleaning the aftermath of the Chernobyl disaster," Kozyrev said.

On Participation in CSCE

LD0811140790 Moscow TASS in English 1246 GMT 8 Nov 90

[Report by TASS correspondent Yevgeniy Henkes]

[Text] United Nations November 8 TASS—"The principles of the new political thinking and democratic tendencies will underlie the foreign policy of the Russian Federation," Russian Foreign Minister A.V. Kozyrev said at a news conference at the U.N. headquarters on Wednesday [7 November].

He described efforts to muster support for the programme of cooperation in extending international assistance to clean up the aftermath of the Chernobyl accident as the priority for the Russian Federation at the 45th U.N. General Assembly session.

Asked if the Russian Federation sought to have an independent vote at the U.N. General Assembly, Kozyrev said that everything would hinge on the new Union treaty. He said that given common approaches to the goals and interests of the foreign policy of the USSR and the Russian Federation, there would be no problems here. If disagreements emerge, an answer will, possibly, be different.

Kozyrev noted that the Russian Federation, like other republics in the European part of the USSR, expressed the wish to participate in the CSCE summit in Paris on November 19-21. However, a consensus needs to be reached here and the Russian Federation is now trying to get agreement with the Union Government regarding the form of its participation in this forum,.

Kozyrev said Russia did not plan to apply for participation as an observer.

On RSFSR Security

PM0211154890 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 43, 23-29 Oct 90 pp 6-8

[Article by Andrey Kozyrev, newly appointed foreign minister of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic: "Building a Bridge—Along or Across a River. The Paramaters of Our Security"—first paragraph is introduction]

[Text] Andrey Kozyrev, 39, is the newly appointed Foreign Minister of the Russian Federation who holds the academic degree of Candidate of Science (History).

He worked as head of the department of international organizations at the Foreign Ministry of the USSR. Work on the article began in the editorial office before its author was appointed to the ministerial post.

The new is no longer a discovery today, a surprise that raises doubts: are things changing indeed? From the language of barrack-type socialism, in which even the word "detente" implied "an unremitting ideological struggle," the Soviet leadership has passed to the language more understandable to the civilized world. The world has breathed with relief and tries hard to back those who initiated this process and to stimulate it. The latest evidence of world support is the awarding of the Nobel Peace Prize to Mikhail Gorbachev. One more sign of the renewal process is the debate in the Soviet parliament on the work of the foreign ministry. The debate was held at the urgent request of deputies who felt the need to know more about what is done in the field of foreign policy and security. Some republican parliaments have gone much farther. They have not only discussed steps taken by the government and received information about its decisions. They have also defined the aims of their own policy in line with the views expressed by deputies or have declared their intention to do that in the near future.

The changes are striking indeed. Nevertheless, we are yet to get rid of preconceived notions and of taboos, both old and new. Only a year ago the very idea of a united Germany seemed incredible to many of us. Only in the spring of this year we could not even imagine that Germany will be a member of NATO. It was stated that such an act would be inadmissible, that it would undermine the security of the Soviet Union and the world.

All this is over now. Moreover, the West has grown stronger, while the socialist world has ceased to exist. Our troops are leaving countries of Central and Eastern Europe and, under an agreement to be signed in Paris, they will be cut much more than the forces of the United States and NATO. Lastly, together with the West, the Soviet Union has branded the friendly Arab regime as an aggressor.

It seems that nothing disastrous has happened, whereas the feeling of security has increased and the threat of a large-scale war is obviously lessening. The question remains, however: have we suffered a defeat without fighting? Who are our allies and opponents now? What national and state interests are we to pursue in our relations with the West and the Third World? There is even a sharper question which can hardly be ignored. What does the notion "our security' mean today, when the Soviet Union ceases to be a unitary state and its constituent republics declare their interests more and more loudly?

The general ideas of the primacy of universal human values and respect for the right of peoples to make their choice can and must evidently help in finding answers to these questions. Adherence to the principles of new thinking will be tested for strength, as it was tested during the revolutions in Eastern Europe. We shall have to apply them in the difficult situation and to break with globalist and great-power approaches.

The foreign policy and public thinking on the whole will have realistically to assess internal and external problems, as well as the problem of survival of not only mankind, but also of Russia and other republics of the USSR.

Our society is faced with the choice of either to renovate the administrative system or abolish it, reshape the policy of the totalitarian state or transform the country on the basis of genuine democracy, revival of the distinctive character and traditions of the peoples of the USSR.

The aims of political, social and economic reforms are clear in the main. The country wants to achieve pluralistic democracy and build a market economy. However, in relations between the republics and with the outside world there is still a fog of understatements and a hodge-podge of new and old notions. Let us take, for instance, the parameters of international security in the East-West relations. We shall see right away that today an important element of the concept of the Soviet Union's national security, namely, the assessment of a real external threat is nonexistent.

In the past, the Soviet Union, in building its armed forces, proceeded from the existence of an enemy who was aggresive "by its very nature." Recently, Moscow declared that it no longer regarded the United States and NATO as its enemy, and statements of this kind have been made by both sides.

It is not yet clear, however, how we regard the United States and NATO in the positive respect. By declaring that the direct military threat to our security has been removed we have not specified where it still remains, at what distance and under what disguise. A great deal depends on certainty in this respect. This concerns the prospects of the current and future talks on disarmament and the contours of the post-confrontation model of the world.

The professional military want to have concrete data and clearly defined tasks. The gap is still evident now—a political "Non-opponent" continues to "draw the fire" of our military preparations. As a result, the Soviet Union continues the arms buildup, both quantitative and qualitative. We still think in terms of the parity and balance of forces with the United States and NATO. This, apparently, explains why our professional military keep calculating the exact amount of warheads and carriers of nuclear weapons of both sides, although it has been generally admitted that it is impossible to win a victory in a nuclear war and absured to keep arsenals of wepaons with an overkill capacity.

It is not only a matter of the appetites of the military-industrial complex, which make themselves felt on both sides, but also of formulating a political task for military experts who define forces and means needed for achieving it.

A decisive shift should therefore be made in the political field. In this respect, the answer to the question of whether the military threat to us now comes from the West can only be negative after a thorough analysis. It is true that powerful armed forces are still kept by both sides. However, the possibility of an attack on our country in Europe or in the Far East is today ruled out completely.

First of all, there are no economic motives for such an attack. Right are those who simply and clearly admit the evident thing. The West with its economy does not need our sugar coupons or queues for sausage. On the contrary, it most likely fears to lose its prosperity in the face of the crisis and instability in a country with nuclear missiles and a population of 300 million.

An attack on a nuclear power is not real from the purely military point of view too. Whether we want it or not, nuclear deterrence provides an absolute shield for us even today. An absolute guarantee against a surprise non-nuclear attack is ensured by mutual openness, control and inspection in Europe.

The main thing is that Western countries are pluralistic democracies. Their governments are under the control of legal public institutions, and this practically rules out the pursuance of an aggressive foreign policy. The experience of the past 45 years shows that relations between democratic states do not contain an element of apriori hostility.

In the system of Western states, except Greece and Turkey (special cases in many respects), the problem of war has essentially been removed. A ramified and effective political mechanism of coordinating interests and settling contradictions has been set up within the framework of bodies of West European and trans-Atlantic cooperation. It is not accidental that the United States and Western Europe want to rule out the possibility of destabilization by means of including the new German state into NATO. The failure to admit that means deliberate self-deception.

Of course, the lack of inherent aggressiveness by no means rules out the West's power reaction to external challenges, those which threaten international stability and security so essential for its economic progress. Among the instances of such reaction are moves taken by the United States to counter the internal or external adventurism of bellicose dictators in the Persian Gulf, North Africa, Grenada or Panama. This also refers to the West's harsh measures against terrorism. All this does not run counter to the non-aggressive nature of democratic states. It merely confirms that by their very existence, they can represent a threat to totalitarian forces, because democracy and totalitarianism are incompatible. This explains why our totalitarian state has always regarded Western countries as its mortal enemies, and their opponents as "natural allies." In this lies the main reason for the rejection of new thinking by those who adhere to the administrative-command system. This also because evident at the recent congresses of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of the Russian Federation.

Let us put it clearly: if there is a potential danger from the West, it is a threat to the Soviet Union as a state which has not yet freed itself completely from the yoke of totalitarianism. No wonder, then, that as democracy is being established in our country, the "enemy image" is disappearing both in the West and the East. There is also another connection: the dispelling of the myth about the hostile encirclement promotes internal emancipation.

In this dialectics lies the explanation of a change in the attitude to our country in the world. Many of our "natural allies" are displeased with our reforms, whereas the "hostile" West tries to help our glassnost to become freedom of speech, democratization, pluralistic democracy, and the economic reform to lead to a real market economy. In other words, it tries to ensure the shaping of those social mechanisms which provide for a maximum blending of the state and national interests and guarantee the subordination of the state to the people, and not vice versa.

Thus, if for the administrative-command system the civilized countries of the West, including also Japan, Australia and some other eastern countries, are "class enemies," for democratic Russia and a renewed Union of sovereign states, they are natural partners.

Such a change in our judgement of ourselves and the Western states is an important line which we have to cross in our understanding of the parameters of our own and international security.

This does not mean, however, that under the democratic system it is possible to harmonize without conflicts our state and national interests between themselves and in relation to the same interests of other countries. But adherence to the values of democracy enables us to solve these problems by civilized means within our country and through a reasonable compromise in other countries.

It is necessary to examine the planned changes in the building of the US armed forces. Defence Secretary Cheney openly declares that, in addition to a reduction in the total strength of the US armed forces and their presence abroad, emphasis will be laid in the future on the maintenance of mobile forces intended for rapid deployment in the event of regional conflicts while preserving the nuclear strategic potential. Instead of "preparedness to wage a world war with the USSR," the United States intends to "concentrate attention not on world, but on regional conflicts."

Is it not time for us to abandon the worst variant in military planning? By taking decisive measures for disarmament and conversion, we shall create additional guarantees of our own security and simultaneously help to patch up our economy initial measures should be taken in this direction. Among them is the full use of parliamentary and public control over military expenditure and programmes and over the departments whose duty is to ensure state security.

We can also cooperate more actively with NATO in the shaping of defensive doctrines and mechanisms for the maintenance of stability. In doing so we have to take into account possible complications in the process of reforms in the East European countries. The mechanisms for this purpose should, naturally, rest on the broad foundation of the CSCE. In this case, the newly formed mecahnisms of European security will be more than just better and peaceful forms of the essentially remaining confrontation, but will have the chance od becoming links in the nascent community of civilized nations.

It is time we should think over a joint concept of security and disarmament based on the understanding of the community of our interests with those of the West. It is in this context that we can create a more stable basis for military-strategic interaction between nuclear powers, first of all between the USSR and the USA, and jointly define acceptable criteria of reasonable sufficiency and the planned development of their armaments.

Possible Candidate for Defense Minister Named

91UM0059A Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 37, 23-30 Sep 90 p 2

[Text] Tatyana Koryagina is a likely claimant to the post of Defence Minister of the Russian Federation. The Schit (Shield) public organization favouring an all-volunteer professional Armed Forces intends to propose her as a candidate for the post of Russia's Defence Minister. The question of who'll occupy this post in Russia's government will be discussed at the session of its Supreme Soviet, as the republic's government continues to be formed. Tatyana Koryagina said she was ready to obey deputies' decision and occupy this historically male post, but she remarked that the role as an independent economic adviser, personally offered her by Boris Yeltsin, corresponds much more to her personal and professional interests.

Journalist Laments Ministers' Absences Abroad

PM0811111090 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 7 Nov 90 Single Edition p 6

[Report by V. Shestopalov: "Beset by Failure"]

[Text] I was beset by failure: It proved practically impossible to perform an ordinary editorial job—to conduct a prefestival interview with a Russian minister. Why, in fact...?

I telephoned my favorite artist, Yuriy Solomin, RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] minister of culture. Alas the minister is currently in the middle of the Mediterranean, on the island of Malta. I failed to find V.I. Kalinin, Russia's health minister, on the spot either—he has gone on a business trip to Stockholm. My search for People's Deputy V.N. Yaroshenko, who heads the RSFSR Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations, also proved fruitless. He is in both Malta and Sweden. That is, he has been obliged to fly from country to country, but this is understandable—the department's profile.

The situation is more complex with Justice Minister N.V. Fedorov. He has been obliged to devote all the festive days to business meetings in Germany. Maybe he will envy his namesake, Finance Minister V.G. Fedorov who, fatigued by currency puzzles, will at this time be strolling through the Vienna woods and listening to the merry ringing of church bells—unless of course he is distracted by Russian Industry Minister V.I. Kisin who has also ended up on Austrian soil during these days.

Probably the most inaccessible to us is Foreign Minister A.V. Kozyrev who has flown across the ocean to blessed America and will not return before Tuesday 13 November.

Such goings-on. Despite my failure, I still wish to congratulate the wandering ministers on the festival, if of course they do not mind.

KGB Investigating Bomb Explosions in Krasnoyarsk

OW0811124190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1900 GMT 2 Nov 90

[Video report by Yu. Sysoyev from the "120 Minutes" program]

[Text] Cases involving the use of homemade explosives have increased in Krasnoyarsk Kray. Our correspondent has tried to analyze these extraordinary incidents:

[Begin recording] [Sysoyev] This occurred just over two months ago in a Tayga gold miners' village. Homemade explosive devices blew up at night in the area of the mine's pumping station. Fortunately nobody was killed, but there was considerable material loss for the state. While the investigation was under way and the circle of suspects in the crime was being determined, we could not take films. But now the investigation of the guilty persons has been completed and soon they will be tried in court.

Anatoliy Yefimovich, such reports must be disturbing to us and I would like to know your opinion as a specialist.

[Anatoliy Yefimovich Safonov, chief of the Krasnoyarsk Kray KGB Administration and a people's deputy of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] In the past few years there have been about 20 cases in Krasnoyarsk Kray linked in one way or another with the use of explosive devices and the use of firearms. I do not mean just threats, of which there were many more, but specific facts. This includes the well-known incident in Norilsk and several incidents in Krasnoyarsk. This photograph shows a trolley bus that was used for testing explosive devices by a group of juveniles in Krasnoyarsk City. You can see what they did to it. Here is a photo that shows the results of the explosion in Norilsk City that we mentioned, at the plant's administration building. This case has already been closed and the criminal sentenced. He was investigated by the state security organs and sentenced. Here is another very tragic event in which a Krasnoyarsk student was testing an explosive device he was putting together right in his apartment. It resulted in damage to his health, and the apartment where the explosion occurred was totally destroyed.

Many people see the seeds of evil yet do nothing about it. But when this evil is perpetrated it ultimately catches up with both the perpetrator and the complacent observer.

[Sysoyev] In the rule-of-law state that we are presently building there must be no substitutes for the meaning of the word humaneness. It must extend only to those who abide by law. Otherwise we will all be defenseless in the face of extremists. This is why the KGB is involved in this. After all, it is the Committee for State Security—and that means your security and ours.

[Safonov] State Security is a combination of security and sovereignty of individuals. There must be forces, and these forces must have both the qualifications and stability and know how to maintain their drive, so to speak, in order to do their job fairly, professionally, and fruitfully. [end recording]

RSFSR-Hyundai Agreement Not 'Trade Contract'

PM0811173190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Nov 90 Second Edition p 5

[Report by TASS correspondent O. Polovko: "Only Readiness So Far"]

[Text] The trade agreement signed 1 November between the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Government and South Korea's Hyundai Corporation "lacks the legal force of a trade contract," Hyundai President Li Men Bak [name as transliterated] told TASS correspondent O. Polovko.

The president of the corporation, who has special responsibility for its foreign economic activities, explained that he and V. Chichkanov, RSFSR deputy minister of foreign economic relations, had signed a document merely expressing both sides' readiness for close economic cooperation.

This explanation, according to the Hyundai president, was necessitated by the appearance of a report in the Soviet media implying that a contract had been signed between the Russian Government and the Hyundai Corporation for the delivery of South Korean consumer goods to Russia, in return for which the republic had pledged to supply South Korea with crude oil. In fact, Li Men Bak announced, the sides only expressed a mutual interest in conducting such a barter deal in the aforementioned document. However, the South Korean businessman went on, "the signed document is by no means a contract."

Moreover, according to the corporation's president, during the discussion of the matter, RSFSR Government representatives "gave the South Korean corporation inaccurate information concerning its authority to conclude a contract for the supply of oil or other raw material resources." "While confirming its eagerness to develop bilateral links with the Soviet Union, the Hyundai Corporation believes that in the future all economic contacts should be conducted through the USSR government's foreign economic departments," Li Men Bak said.

This does not mean, of course, that the corporation is dropping all contacts with the Russian Government, the Hyundai president said. On the contrary, the South Korean side is very interested in mutually advantageous cooperation with the republic. However, he said, the "corporation would not want to discredit itself at the outset in the eyes of Soviet people, who might infer from previous reports that Hyundai has already pledged to deliver goods to Russia."

Western Republics

Dubossary Official Cited on Moldovan Situation

LD0811153690 Moscow TASS in English 1447 GMT 8 Nov 90

[Report by TASS correspondents Fedor Angeliy and Valeriy Demidetskiy]

[Text] Kishinev November 8 TASS—Last day and night were calm in Dubossary, a city in eastern Moldavia [Moldova] where ethnic crisis caused bloodshed on November 2.

A rally devoted to Revolution Day, the national holiday in the USSR, was held in Dubossary on November 7, Viktor Oborok, the second secretary of the Soviet Communist Party district committee, told TASS.

But there is still a long way to normalising the situation. The bridge across the Dnestr river continues to be blocked with machinery and volunteer militia aides. Oborok says that this is a forced measure, because there are no guarantees that the tragedy will not recur. He said a hospital had people with gunshot wounds. All in all, more than 30 people asked for medical aid.

Oborok sharply criticised the Moldavian Government which, as he contends, ignores the municipal authorities. "It does not give any instructions to bodies under its authority. Even telephone calls by members of government do not reach here," Oborok said.

TASS has learnt from official sources that a Russian parliamentary commisson left Kishinev for Dubossary today for a first-hand look at the situation. The delegation is accompanied by Moldavian First Deputy Prime Minister Konstantin Oborok.

A delegation of women, who held a hunger strike, left Dubossary for Moscow. They intend to meet representatives of the Soviet Government, the Interior Ministry and the Soviet Women's Committee. The delegation wants to get guarantees from the centre that the tragedy will not recur and those who are held responsible for the bloodshed will be punished.

The concern by Moldavia's non-indigenous population becomes more understandable against a backdrop of a statement by chairman of the Moldavian Popular Front Executive Committee Yuriy Roshka, which was broadcast by Moldavian television.

The statement, which is couched in confrontational tones, accuses both the Soviet and foreign press of "fanning up psychosis" for the purpose of "introducing (Soviet) troops in areas with predominantly non-indigenous population." Roshka imputes to Western journalists covering developments in Moldavia "the use of stereotypes created

The statement defends Moldavian Prime Minister Mircha Druk, whom part of the republic's Russian-speaking population regards as one of the culprits of the bloodshed.

Roshka states that "one of the (Soviet) empires' key tasks is to remove the Mircha Druk government, the first non-communist government in the republic's history"

Mass Demonstration Held in Lugansk 7 Nov

LD0811132990 Kiev Domestic Service in Ukrainian 1945 GMT 7 Nov 90

[Text] A mass demonstration of working people was held in Lugansk today. Columns of working people marched past the Lenin monument in Kotsybynskiy street. They carried posters calling for the democratization of society and the consolidation of progressive forces and denouncing nationalism, separatism, and violence. Representatives of all political parties and currents were granted the possibility of expressing their attitude to the October anniversary.

Reports from mining towns testify that the October festivity is being actively marked there.

Reports Examine All-Ukraine 'Rukh' Assembly

Chairman Interviewed

AU0711083090 Budapest MAGYAR HIRLAP in Hungarian 3 Nov 90 p 6

[Interview with Ivan Drach, leader of the Ukrainian People's Movement for Perestroyka, by Laszlo Vida in Kiev; October: "State of War?"—first paragraph is MAGYAR NEMZET introduction]

[Excerpts] Under the leadership of Ivan Drach, a mild-mannered author and poet in his forties, the Ukrainian People's Movement for Perestroyka—known to Ukrainians as Rukh—has developed within a year from being a persecuted opposition movement to being a significant parliamentary force and the feared rival of the authorities. Drach was interviewed by our newspaper during the Rukh congress last week, before the reelection of the movement's leadership. At the time, rumors were spreading about Drach's intention to resign. After the interview, Drach's supporters persuaded him to stay on after all, and some 2,000 delegates charged Drach with the continued leadership of Rukh. [passage omitted]

[Vida] The large proportion of national minorities in the Ukraine—mainly the Russian community—may cause problems for an independent Ukraine.

[Drach] That is precisely why we have to do more than just outline a Ukrainian national renaissance program. We have to draft a democratic model that could interest the approximately 10 million Russians who live in the Ukraine, as well as all our other national minorities (Jews, Hungarians, Bulgarians, Slovaks, Gagausy, Greeks, etc.) in the implementation of our model, and in the establishment of complete independence.

[Vida] However, nowadays, many people fear the excesses of Ukrainian nationalism. To what extent are these fears justified?

[Drach] I think that excesses are natural, and we cannot be surprised if many people are alarmed by these excesses: All of us become somewhat oversensitive in the midst of all this new freedom. Romantic euphoria characterizes certain stages of every movement of this type; it does not only apply to the Ukraine.

[Vida] How do you see the future of the Ukraine? Is it not merely an illusion to believe that welfare and prosperity will set in once the Ukraine gains its independence?

[Drach] Such chimerical statements are made from time to time, and they hardly have any foundation. At the same time, our economists have analyzed the quasi inextricable system of federal links, and they have come to the conclusion that the Ukraine would be able to support itself and one and a half similar countries on a normal level, as long as the economy was relatively normalized. [passage omitted]

[Vida] Could the Ukraine secede completely from the federated republics of the Soviet Union?

[Drach] There is no indication of this, and that is not the issue, either. When we talk of decolonization, we mean that we want to put an end to this total submission and dependency on the center of the empire. If we find that conditions are mutually beneficial, then we are prepared to cooperate with any state, but we do not want Moscow as an intermediary. As I said before, the Ukraine has all the economic possibilities of an independent country. [passage omitted]

[Vida] Central Soviet newspapers are increasingly hinting at the threat of a military coup. Do you think that this threat really exists?

[Drach] A coup would be absolutely pointless in Kiev. The democratic independence process is irreversible, although it can be suspended for a while. A military coup would only increase tensions. If generals did interfere, they would have no idea what would happen next. The KGB and the Army have nothing to offer except violence.

[Vida] Do you agree with the people who press for the earliest possible free elections in the Ukraine?

[Drach] People already showed great indifference at the spring elections, which were carried out according to a fundamentally new system. It can be feared that an election turnout would be even lower at this point, particularly in the countryside, where partocratic [partokracia] rule still knows no limits. The Ukrainian parliament seems to have found a sensible compromise: It has decided that a popular vote of confidence should be held on the Supreme Council some time next year. The only dubious point is that the referendum is being prepared under the exclusive supervision of the CPSU. We have gained time, and now we have to concentrate on this issue. In any case, the formula is clear: Either they call an election, or Gorbachev sends in military reinforcements for "the democratic forces." One thing is certain: Rukh wants to force through changes by means of a peaceful political battle. Rukh wants to ride on the wave of mass discontent with the authorities' helplessness and the economy's collapse, and our movement wants to mobilize people who have been disenchanted and frightened.

Future Prospects Viewed

LD0511175290 Kiev International Service in Ukrainian 1900 GMT 3 Nov 90

[Text] [Announcer] As we have already reported, the second all-Ukrainian assembly of Rukh [Ukrainina People's Movement for Perestroyka] has ended in Kiev. It elected the governing body of the organization. Writer Ivan Drach has again become chairman of Rukh. The assembly has passed additions and changes to the rules and program.

We now offer you a program entitled "Where is Rukh going; what principles and ideals is it upholding?" We hand the microphone over to journalist Anton Honcharskyy.

[Honcharskyy] During the four days of the congress its delegates were putting [the finishing] touches to the tactics and strategy of Rukh's further advancement in the republic's public-political life. The congress agreed that at present Rukh's main aim is to be the creation of an independent democratic Ukrainian state by parliamentary means. Rukh has removed from its banner the words: for restructuring, and openly stated its opposition to the ideology of the Communist Party. Its present status actually makes it impossible for communists to be members of Rukh. A string of decisions was passed, including one on creating Ukraine's economic borders. Other documents and resolutions stress the necessity of introducing a national monetary unit and creating an army.

According to the official mass information media, the general attitude to the radicalization of Rukh is not unanimous. Therefore, in my view, it will be of interest to you how members and leaders of this mass organization evaluate the documents adopted. All of the following interviews were recorded during a news conference. Answering questions were Volodymyr Chernyak, USSR people's deputy and doctor of economy; Volodymyr Mulyava, deputy chairman of the Rukh. The latter is at the microphone:

[Begin recording] [Zayets] Yes, the radicalization is noticeable, although very balanced. It provies a balanced evaluation. In other words, it maps out the trend, and of great potential at that. A serious decision was passed on creating the economic borders of Ukraine. I think that Volodymyr Kyrylovych (?Chernyak) will be able to say much more on that for it was he who drafted it. As for me, I would like to draw your attention to the following. The time has come indeed when Ukraine must face the choice: Either it will advance forward or return to dictatorship. That is why all the burden of political struggle is being transfered to the political sphere. [end recording]

Answering questions from Soviet and foreign journalists concerning Rukh's program and adopted decisions, Volodymyr Chernyak substantiated the need to create the economic borders of Ukraine and introducing a national monetary unit. To achieve this, it is necessary, he believes, to solve at the same time the urgent and strategical tasks:

[Begin recording] [Chernyak] The urgent tasks are linked with the fact that the consumer market is collapsing. The monetary system has all but disintegrated. The ruble has ceased to be our all-Union currency. It has different purchasing powers in different regions. The flight from money is taking place. Enterprises are switching to barter dealings. Well, none of this is news to you. But why I am dwelling on it, you may ask? Because there is no normal way-out from the situation we are in now. So much time has been wasted. When we hear all those indignations about separatists, about their plans for economic borders—and indignations are expressed not only by the imperial rulers in Moscow but also by Russian democrats and democrats of other hues—I would like to say this: It was they who compelled us to contemplate this action. We cannot do anything else; we have no right [to an alternative]. For example, if the central government resorted to patching up the budget by printing money while we in the republic avoided doing the same, then what we would recieve is a cheaper ruble. This is one thing.

Second, if we do not take any measures, if we fail to increase prices for our products, then people from other regions will flood us, buy up everything, and ship it away. What I mean is that at present we face the need to take urgent economic measures. If we do not do anything, then what we will get will be famine. I am not exaggerating. A catastrophe will be inevitable. That is why the Rukh assembly adopted a decision on creating the economic borders of Ukraine. What it means is that the introduction of a national monetary unit has to be prepared immediately. We propose to call the unit a Hryvnya—it could be called something else, that is not important at present. But this step must be taken urgently, that is, to introduce our own currency to our internal national-republican market with the help of checks, coupons, and such. I repeat, these measures have been forced on us and we shall take them.

Further on, we believe that a law on a Ukrainain customs service must be adopted immediately and the establishment of the economic borders of Ukraine with all union republics by 1 December 1990. We propose to trade with the other republics in accordance with world prices and quotas and licences of [word indistinct] [end recording]

Volodymyr Mulyava extends Chernyak's line of thinking:

[Begin recording] [Mulyava] Volodymyr Kyrylovych [Chernyak] is right in saying that our republic, while on the road of attaining self-rule and independence, is forced to erect protective fences, including economic borders. But I would like to add that we are not only closing our borders, but also opening them. In what sense? In the sense that at present the republic is advancing along the road of opening our borders for joint enterprise with the Ukrainian diaspora. All of these changes wee linked with the fact that the way out of the crisis amounts to withdrawal from the USSR.

A year ago we still entertained certain illusions, certain expectations. The situation then was not as grave as it is now. Now the situation is essentially different. We have realized that to overcome the crisis means to leave the USSR. A year ago we also strove for an independent [Ukrainian] state, but we thought that it would be better to avoid clear-cut formulations. Maybe it was simply impossible to formulate as precisely as we do now. There is only one way out: A sovereign, self-ruled, independent Ukraine will be able to solve its problems. Without this condition nothing will be solved.

I would sum it up this way: Rukh has taken a new step in its evolution, namely from the People's Movement for Restructuring to the People's Movement of Ukraine for Independence.

I think that at present we are about to enter a period of inevitable disintegration. However, I am sure that after a certain time Ukraine, not being self-sufficient, will be compelled to sign certain agreements. But these agreements and relations will be those of a sovereign, independent state, of a horizontal nature, multilateral and bilateral relations with various states.

It may happen that some vertical organ will appear for coordinating our actions. But meanwhile we are facing the need for disintegration. Only after having covered this ground, after achieving sovereignty and independence, after becoming an independent state, we can return to the path of integration. [end recording]

Lvov Printers Halt Publication of Newspapers

PM0811175390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Nov 90 Union Edition p 2

[Dispatch by Stepan Troyan under the rubric: "Direct Line": "'Coupon' Strike"]

[Text] Lvov—On 6 November many customers found only two local newspapers—ZA VILNU UKRAINU ("For A Free Ukraine") and MOLODA GALICHINA ("Young Galichina") at the counters of the city's Soyuzpechat kiosks. The central and republic publications did not come off the presses.

It is already known that, since 1 November, trade in the Ukraine has switched to the coupon system. Putting it bluntly, however, the transition turned out to be—mildly speaking—not only premature, but also not properly prepared. In other words, there was a shortage not just of goods but also of consumers' coupons. It emerged in the VILNA UKRAINA Publishing House that coupons to the agreed value of 70 percent (of earnings) were issued mainly to employees of the administration apparatus. The workers were issued coupons to the value of only 50 percent, and they have already been graphically dubbed "money crutches."

"This happened because we did not receive the full volume of coupons," Publishing House Director Ye. Dzhurik explained. "The whole collective was informed of this, and the strike committee was informed of it specially. However, at 1800 hours on 5 November, the latter adopted the following decision: Not to print newspapers until the administration issues coupons in accordance with the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] resolution and until it pays the workers bonuses for newsprint savings. A political demand was added to the purely economic one overnight: The majority of people working in the newspaper shop on that day joined the forces that are demanding the nationalization of CPSU and Komsomol [All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League] property."

I am not going to condemn the collective of the aforementioned shop for its tough actions. I would just like to ask one question: How would the typesetters and printers feel if bakers, for instance, were to behave like them? Before sending this dispatch to IZVESTIYA, I rang the VILNA UKRAINA Publishing House once more and asked whether the "foreign" newspapers would come out 7 November.

"We hope so," was the hesitant reply.

Belorussian Cities Hold 7 November Celebrations

LD0811155690 Minsk Domestic Service in Belorussian 0515 GMT 8 Nov 90

[Excerpts] The slogans born during the October revolution in 1917 are becoming so urgent for the Belorussia of today: "All power to the soviets," "Land to peasants, factories to workers." They remind us on the need to persistently carry on with the attaintment of their meaning.

Minsk—For the first time the October anniversary celebrations passed in the republic's capital without a traditional demonstration of working people. For the first time, alongside the customary slogans, alternative ones appeared in Lenin Square. By 0900 columns of working people from all districts of Minsk filled the square. The troops of the capital's garrison were lined up prior to the parade. Kostenko, commander of the Belorussian military area, received a report that the troops were ready for the march-past. He inspected the units and congratulated servicemen on the festival.

Flowers were laid at the foot of the Lenin monument on behalf of the Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet, the Council of Ministers, the Communist Party of Belorussia Central Committee, veterans and other organizations, and also foreign consultates-general in Minsk. The meeting was opened by Dementey, chairman of the SSR Supreme Soviet. The state anthems of the USSR and the SSR were played, and then the military parade began.

Afterwards, a sanctioned meeting organized by the Belorussian National Front, bearing an anticommunist character, took place in the same square.

Brest—A festive procession was opened by columns of school pupils and production front-rankers, followed by columns of working people carrying posters in favor of restructuring, socialist choice, and civil peace and accord.

Afterwards, a separate procession of democratic forces took place.

Vitebsk—Participants of the military parade were warmly greeted by inhabitants of the city. [passage omitted] A meeting took place in the central square and a festive procession passed along the main thoroughfare. [passage omitted]

Gomel—The decision of the city council not to finance the festivity measures evoked numerous contradictory attitudes in the city. However, the presidiums of district soviets managed to find necessary means, and working people were able to mark this historical date. [passage omitted]

Mogilev—Simultaneously with the festive meeting and demonstration in Lenin Square, representatives of the Democratic Bloc held a sanctioned meeting on Sovetskaya Square devoted to the memory of victims of the totalitarian regime. [passage omitted]

Belorussian Deputies View Contacts With Cuba

FL0211172690 Havana Tele Rebelde Network in Spanish 1337 GMT 2 Nov 90

[Excerpt] Last night, Belorussian deputies Lieutenant General Vladimir Vasilyevich Kovalyonok and Professor Anatoliy Yegorevich Volkov departed for the USSR. They spent 10 days in our country on the invitation of the Public Health Ministry. Shortly before leaving, they gave an interview to our reporter:

[Begin recording] [Correspondent] Cuba had the privilege of hosting two deputies from the Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic. They are Lieutenant General Kovalyonok, cosmonaut, twice-named hero of the USSR, and deputy chief of the Center for the Training of Cosmonauts; and Volkov, professor of the Belorussian Academy of Sciences and member of the special legislative commission for problems related to the catastrophe of the Chernobyl electronuclear plant. They gave their impressions of the treatment being received by the children who were affected by the Chernobyl disaster.

[Kovalyonok] in Russian with simultaneous translation into Spanish] At the invitation of the Cuban Public Health Ministry, we two Belorussian deputies have been here on this magnificent island of Cuba from 22 October until today to learn about the progress of the children who were affected by the accident at the Chernobyl center. We have studied in-depth the state of health, the state of infant prophylaxis, and the state of basic activities being carried out in the sphere of medicine.

We have viewed with great attention the Jose Marti Center where the Soviet children are already improving, and we have reached the conclusion that Cuba has all the necessary medical, scientific, organizational and basic medical materials to improve the health of children from the USSR—including our children from Belorussia—on a large scale: many thousands of children.

Today, we met with our ambassador to the Republic of Cuba. We told him the conclusions that we had reached regarding the state of public health in Cuba. We expressed the opinion that Belorussia should establish direct contacts with Cuba. Our ambassador approved this and we told him that on returning to the USSR and Belorussia we will provide a detailed report to the Belorussian Supreme Soviet and the government of our republic, stating that it is necessary to put those contacts on a new level, on a scientific basis. We will do everything possible to ensure that this process is based on a new principle: examination and selection on the basis of basic research between Soviet and Cuban specialists. [passage omitted] [end recording]

Abridged Belorussian Market Program Issued

914A0062A Minsk SELSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 25 Oct 90 p 1

["Main Points of the Program for Transfer of the Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic to a Market Economy"—SELSKAYA GAZETA headline]

[Text] **As was already reported, the republic Supreme Soviet has approved the basic provisions of the government program and suggestions for changing the Belorussian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] over to a market economy on 1 November of this year.**

We offer for the readers' attention a brief account of the main sections of the republic program.

1. THE SOCIOECONOMIC SITUATION IN THE REPUBLIC

The Belorussian SSR economy, burdened by the flaws of the old system of management, is experiencing a deep crisis. It is entering into market relations under conditions of a retardation of production rates, an aggravation of ecological problems centered around the consequences of the Chernobyl catastrophe, a decline in the consumer market, deterioration of material and technical supply, rising inflation, and a declining standard of living of the people.

All these processes are irreversible if the previous system is retained.

2. THE NEED FOR A TRANSITION TO THE MARKET ECONOMY. STAGES OF THE TRANSITION

An objective condition for emerging from the crisis is a transition to market relations. The market creates effective self-regulatory mechanisms and incentives for increased economic activity, and it forms a new economic environment based on a diversity of forms of ownership, the development of entrepreneurship and competition, openness, and integration into the Union and world economy. Moreover, rational methods of state regulation are used and the social protection of the citizens is assured.

The Union programs for transition to the market are unacceptable for the republic from the standpoint of a number of their fundamental provisions. Some do not take into account the specific features of Belorussia and above all the consequences of the catastrophe at the Chernobyl nuclear power plant or the shortage of raw material and energy resources, the existing structure of industry with its developed complex of science-intensive and defense branches, and so forth. In this connection there arises a need for the development and adoption of its own, Belorussian variant of the program. The period of transition to the market will last two years (from the fourth quarter of 1990 to the fourth quarter of 1992) and will include three main stages:

Stage I: fourth quarter of 1990 to first quarter of 1991—the stage of "extraordinary measures";
Stage II: second quarter of 1991 to fourth quarter of 1991—the stage of "maintaining the balance";
Stage III: first quarter of 1992 to fourth quarter of 1992—the stage of "positive strides" or "reinforcement of market structures."

Under the existing socioeconomic crisis conditions, a transition to market relations is impossible without extraordinary measures to stabilize the economy: improvement of finances, strengthening of monetary circulation, maintenance of existing economic ties, prevention of a drop in production, protection of the republic's consumer market, saturation of it with goods, temporary norm setting for their distribution, and so forth.

3. PRINCIPLES FOR BELORUSSIA'S PARTICIPATION IN THE ECONOMIC COOPERATION OF SOVEREIGN STATES

Belorussia is building its relations with other sovereign republics on the basis of principles of the Declaration of State Sovereignty. The republic Supreme Soviet legislatively regulates all important aspects of life, economic relations with other states, and questions of the development of economic ties and the organization of a common market space. The republic forms its own credit and budget-tax systems, it independently decides questions of foreign economic activity, and the financing of functions delegated to Union organs is provided through fixed payments or a federal tax from the republic budget. A distinction is made between it and other republics and the Union with respect to the loan, foreign currency, and diamond funds, and also the gold reserve. Policy is coordinated in the areas of regulation of monetary circulation, prices, quotas, and so forth.

4. FORMS OF OWNERSHIP

In Belorussia various forms of ownership have equal rights: state, collective, individual, and also various kinds of enterprises (joint stock, cooperative, national, and so forth). Moreover, private property and hired labor force are recognized within the limits and under the conditions determined by republic legislation.

Private ownership of the land will not be allowed until the end of the transition period and the completion of the resettlement of residents from regions that suffered from the catastrophe at the Chernobyl nuclear power plant. The land is placed at the disposal of the local soviets which offer it free of charge for permanent ownership and use to corporate bodies and also under conditions of leasing to physical persons for use during their lifetimes and to be passed on to their heirs.

5. WITHDRAWAL OF THE STATE AND PRIVATIZATION

With the state's withdrawal from the economy and the privatization of state property, citizens of the republic are given the opportunity to become owners of state property through purchase and the receipt of a certain part of it free of charge and by free choice through granting securities, special accounts, and so forth to citizens. By the end of 1991 the majority of small enterprises in the sphere of services, trade, and public catering will be sold, leased, or turned over free of charge, and a considerable share of the enterprises in light, the food, and other branches of industry and construction organizations will no longer be owned by the state. Priority in the selection of forms of privatization of state enterprises (with the exception of new enterprises created with budget funds and in other cases stipulated in the law) and also a preferential right to purchase state property are granted to workers of the privatized enterprise or to citizens of Belorussia.

6. THE BANKING SYSTEM

Belorussia is creating its own banking system, which includes the National Bank of the Belorussian SSR, the Foreign Economic Bank of the Belorussian SSR, and commercial banks (joint stock, cooperative, and so forth). The National Bank, being the central bank, reports to the republic Supreme Soviet and implements monetary and credit policy. As a sovereign subject the National Bank of the Belorussian SSR may enter the Union reserve system. If it is impossible to coordinate with other republics the principal issues of stabilization of the economy, emission of money, the use of credit resources, and so forth, Belorussia will introduce its own currency.

7. THE BUDGET AND TAX SYSTEM

The republic forms and implements its budget and tax policy independently. Incomes and expenditures of the republic and local budgets are clearly distinguished from one another. Higher organs are not allowed to interfere in the budget processes of local areas. Budget allocations for maintaining institutions of education, culture, public health, and social security are determined taking inflation into account.

A strict budget policy is followed with respect to other items of expenditure. Corporate and physical persons on the territory of the republic make payments into the republic and local budgets, the republic social security fund, and nonbudget funds. Benefits are envisioned for small enterprises, innovative activity, increasing the output of consumer goods, and other priority directions for the development of the national economy. A unified system will be introduced for taxation of enterprises, regardless of the forms of their ownership. Tax rates are established by the Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet, and possible tax breaks by the Belorussian SSR Council of Ministers and other executive organs within the limits of their authority.

8. PRICE SETTING

The stage-by-stage introduction of free price setting will be accompanied by an increase in retail prices for consumer goods. In this connection there is to be a system of social protection of the population from inflation, and state control is retained for prices on a limited list of goods and services (approximately 90 groups of goods necessary to maintain a subsistence living level). The prices of these goods will be regulated by the republic government taking into account the higher wholesale and procurement prices and rates, with a simultaneous differentiated compensation to the population for expenditures (depending on their incomes). Price controls will be removed from goods that are not necessities. Retail prices of goods sold in the city and the country will be equalized.

9. SOCIAL GUARANTEES AND PROTECTION OF THE POPULATION

In the stage of transition to market relations, in order not to allow a reduction in the population's standard of living from inflation and temporary unemployment, there is to be a special system of social guarantees and protection of various social groups (the disabled, those with fixed incomes, and so forth).

The minimum consumer budget and the minimum wage level which is mandatory for enterprises and organizations with all forms of ownership will be determined taking into account the change in prices, a wage reform which stimulates interest in labor and provides for its coordination with the final result will be conducted, compensation and stipends will be introduced, incomes will be indexed, interest rates on the population's investments will increase, and special work places are being created for disabled persons and retirees. A republic unemployment fund, pension fund, and social security fund are being formed.

10. CLEANUP AFTER THE CATASTROPHE AT THE CHERNOBYL NUCLEAR POWER PLANT UNDER THE CONDITIONS OF THE MARKET ECONOMY

There are to be special mechanisms that provide for unconditional fulfillment of the program for cleaning up after the Chernobyl catastrophe:

a state order for the production of the necessary products, work, and services for surmounting the consequences of the disaster;

a system of interest-free credit, breaks on the payment of customs duties, and subsidies for products and work delivered for these purposes;

strict economic sanctions for deviation from participation in this work, failure to meet deadlines, and poor quality of products and services.

It is considered necessary:

when concluding the Union treaty, for a separate section to stipulate the allotment of financial and material resources for cleaning up after the Chernobyl disaster by the USSR Government or a special Union fund;

to declare this disaster zone open for broad international cooperation;

to develop a package of legislative acts that provide for the social protection of people who suffered from the disaster under the conditions of the transition to market relations at any level of socioeconomic development;

to determine the status of the territories that have been subjected to radioactive pollution.

11. LEGISLATIVE AND ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT FOR THE TRANSITION TO MARKET RELATIONS

The transition to the market requires corresponding legislative support. The following groups of draft laws have priority:

ensurance of the republic's national sovereignty (concerning economic independence, Belorussian SSR citizenship, and so forth);

monetary and financial regulation of the economy (concerning taxation, the Belorussian SSR National Bank, banks on the territory of the republic, the budget structure, price setting, and so forth);

social protection of the population (concerning employment, indexation of incomes, the minimum consumer budget, and so forth).

The practical actions for the transition to the market should be based on a system of organizational support and a plan for basic measures for implementing the programs.

12. POSSIBLE SOCIOECONOMIC CONSEQUENCES OF THE TRANSITION PERIOD

Implementation of the program will lead to increased economic activity, a higher level of the utilization of labor, material, and financial resources, and the achievement of balance of the national economy. At the same time the changeover to the market, especially in the initial stage, will be accompanied by a number of negative phenomena—a reduction in investment activity, a reduction in the growth rates of production volumes, and the shutdown of a number of enterprises that are operating at a loss or are not very profitable. There will be a problem with unemployment, social differentiation among the population will increase, and other social problems will be aggravated. These negative phenomena will be overcome as the economy stabilizes and market relations are formed.

Caucasus

Armenian Resolution Called Unconstitutional

LD0811154190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 8 Nov 90

[Text] A statement by the 29th Armenian Communist Party Congress Presidium addressed to the republic's Supreme Soviet has been published in Yerevan. It says that the resolution adopted by a simple majority at the Supreme Soviet on 5 November contradicts the Armenian Constitution, that is the resolution on suspending the activities of public-political organizations in all state institutions and organizations, enterprises, law enforcement bodies, military detachments, and education establishments. The authors of the statement consider that this resolution is an attempt to destabilize the situation in the republic and to slow down the process of democratization.

Meanwhile, our Yerevan correspondent adds that a general meeting of the republic Academy of Sciences has adopted a decision on its depoliticization. Academy President Viktor Ambartsumyan stated: The Academy will occupy itself only with science and will assist in the rebirth of Armenia.

Trade Unions Claim Tourist Facilities' Ownership

LD0811204590 Moscow TASS in English 1912 GMT 8 Nov 90

[Report by SAKARTVELO-TASS correspondent Eduard Ediberidze]

[Text] Tbilisi November 8 TASS—The Georgian Confederation of Independent Trade Unions has issued a declaration, published here today, claiming ownership of all resorts and tourist and sports facilities on republican territory that were earlier subordinate to USSR trade unions.

The document declares all regulatory enactments, earlier issued by the Central Trade Union Council and federal departments subordinate to it and touching on the property right of Georgian trade unions, null and void.

Central Asia

Uzbek Party To Seek Autonomy Within CPSU

PM0811164190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Nov 90 Union Edition p 2

[Dispatch by Andrey Orlov under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Independent Party"]

[Text] Tashkent—Communists were asking last night: Is the Uzbek Communist Party leaving the CPSU? The answer was to be found in the draft Uzbek Communist Party Statutes approved by the republic Central Committee Bureau.

Its essence can perhaps be expressed thus: We and the CPSU have common strategic aims, but our tactics are different. The republic Communist Party will become an autonomous political organization and it will be independent in the elaboration of its program and in its political line if these statutes are adopted at the second phase of the 22d Congress of Uzbek Communists.

The draft stresses that the Communist Party will operate within the framework of the Uzbek SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Constitution and Soviet laws, and on the basis of and within the framework of the CPSU Program and Statutes. However, if the CPSU Central Committee adopts a decision that restricts the autonomous status of the Communist Party or that is contradictory to the republic's interests, then the Uzbek Communist Party may demand that the questions at issue be examined at a CPSU Central Committee Plenum or a joint CPSU Central Committee and Central Control Commission Plenum.

Uzbek Supreme Soviet Reviews Refugees, Economy

91US0078A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
3 Nov 90 Union Edition p 2

[Article by A. Orlov: "Decisions of Uzbekistan Legislature"]

[Text] Tashkent—**The results of the third session of the republic Supreme Soviet were unexpected for many people. This was the first time the people's deputies had so heatedly discussed the national issue that had appeared suddenly on the agenda.**

"When we are in other regions of the country we hear: 'Are there still Russians living in Uzbekistan? Why do you have so many refugees?' " said the deputies. "We have to take a long time explaining the situation and, above all, arranging business contacts."

I.A. Karimov, president of the Uzbek SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic], noted during his speech that recently in a number of publications there were increasingly negative attitudes toward the Russian-speaking population. But of the 177,000 people who left the republic last year, 17,000 were Russians and 25,000 were Uzbeks. Crimean Tatars and Meskhetian Turks, moving toward their historical homeland, comprised 70 percent of those who departed.

The activity of Intersoyuz and its leaders was criticized sharply at the session. It was noted that they are creating tension in the republic and fanning interethnic strife comes under an article of the Criminal Code.

During the television broadcast of the session meeting, addressing the Russian-speaking population living in Uzbekistan, the president of the republic said:

"I categorically state that there will be no discrimination against anybody and nobody's rights will be encroached upon. We are living and shall continue to live as one family."

From the results of the discussion, the participants in the session adopted an "appeal from the people's deputies of Uzbekistan to the population of the republic and the USSR Supreme Soviet."

They founded a newspaper of the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet, NARODNOYE SLOVO, in the Russian language (the presentation issue of the newspaper KHALK SUZI in the Uzbek language coincided with the opening of the session). It was also decided to publish newspapers of the republic Supreme Soviet and government in the Tajik, Crimean Tatar, and Kazakh languages, as well.

The determination of their path to the market was a decisive event in the life of the republic. Uzbekistan decided not to copy the Union documents. The chairman of the republic Council of Ministers, Sh.R. Mirsayidov, was quite definite: "...it is impossible to follow the recommendations when they are developed in the center without taking into account the specific features of the socioeconomic development of each of the republics. It is impossible to jump into the web of market relations without thinking about the social security of the workers."

The Supreme Soviet of Uzbekistan adopted a decree on stage-by-stage transition to market relations. This path is longer, but the deputies think that it will make it possible to avoid a sharp jump in prices and mass unemployment, which would be a catastrophe for a region where there are now more than a million unemployed and half of the population is living on the brink of poverty.

To strengthen the republic budget, taxes on raw material and imported goods, a tax on foreign tourism, and a number of others will be introduced for the first time. If the state budget is not balanced, all tax on profit will go into the republic budget.

At the session they discussed the package of draft laws, some of which were sent for further development to the committees of the republic Supreme Soviet.

On the last work day of the session, a law was adopted on transforming the Council of Ministers of Uzbekistan into a cabinet of ministers under the republic president.

The apparatus of the president and the Council of Ministers will be combined and at the same time the president will become the chairman of the cabinet of ministers. Thus there will be greater concentration of republic power. The position of vice president of the Uzbek SSR was instituted. At the suggestion of President I.A. Karimov, this post was filled by Sh.R. Mirsayidov, who until yesterday was chairman of the Uzbek SSR Council of Ministers.

Soldier's 'Mothers of Kazakhstan' Congress Meets

LD0711215190 Alma-Ata KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 31 Oct 90 p 1

[Excerpts] It was not easy to gain access to the first Constituent Congress of soldiers' Mothers of Kazakhstan. The fact is that the entire Alma Ata garrison Officers' Center was surrounded by the militia, which was meticulously checking documents. Journalists had to go through a similar check at the entrance to the building. Asked what all the fuss was about, a militiaman in the cordon waved his hand vaguely and said "You get all sorts of people here...." [passage omitted]

One hundred and three delegates from all republic oblasts gathered in the Garrison Officers' Center to discuss the military service problems of Kazakh conscripts. All the speaker stressed that the Army should be united and indivisible, and that calls from certain quarters for a boycott of the autumn call-up can do nothing but harm at a time when cohesion and consolidation on the part of the Army and the people are more necessary then ever. Alarming facts were also heard. For example, in the last two years 354 conscripts from Kazakhstan have died of various causes in the Army. The number of deserters from military units is on the increase. Over 11,000 young men with a poor grasp of the Russian language were called up from Kazakhstan in 1988-1989. For that reason they are sent to construction batallions or railway and internal troops where social tension is created. Another figure was cited. Thirty percent of soldiers from military-construction battallions have convictions and conscripts who are in poor health are sent there too. All this is a prime cause for institutionalized bullying and we must not reconcile ourselves with this shameful phenomenon. [passage omitted]